



38/38/B

O. xx . 26.

Johnston, London
5/-
17/8/28

W. J. Spurway 1782

TWO
DISSERTATIONS.

I. ON THE
GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

II. AN
EXAMINATION

OF

Sir ISAAC NEWTON's Objections to the
CHRONOLOGY of the OLYMPIADS.

BY THE LATE

SAMUEL MUSGRAVE, M.D. F.R.S.

LONDON,
PRINTED BY J. NICHOLS.

MDCCLXXXII.

DISSEMINATION

OF THE

EXAMINATION

OF THE NEWTON'S QUESTION TO THE
COURTESY OF THE OLYMPIAN

BY THE DATE

JAMES H. MUSGRAVE, M.D. F.R.S.

LONDON

PRINTED BY J. MICHOLLS

MCCCLXXXIII



ADVERTISEMENT.

THOUGH many of the most liberal Subscribers in the following list have signified an intention of requiring only one copy, it has been thought proper to do justice to their generosity, by setting down the full amount of each subscription.

The Names of the SUBSCRIBERS.

A.

Mr. Abbot, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Mr. Abbott, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. J. Acland, Vicar of Broad Clyft, Devon. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Adams, Master of Pemb. Coll. Ox. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Adams, Rector of S. Okington, Effex.
 Rev. Mr. Alderson, Norwich, L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Allenfon, M. A. Fell. of Jefus C. Camb.
 Mr. Allington, of Peter-houfe, Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Alt. L. P.
 Lord Vifcount Althorp. L. P.
 Mr. Anfley, B. A. of Trinity Coll. Camb.
 R. Pepper Arden, Efq.
 Rev. Mr. Atkinson, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 Rev. Mr. Atkinson, M. A. Fell. of Trin. H. Camb.
 John Aubrey, Efq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Aufin, Fell. of Wadham Coll. Oxf, L. P.
 Mrs. Awfe of Windfcott, Devon. 10 L. P.

B.

The Lord Bagot, 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Bagot, Dean of Chriftchurch, Ox. 6 L. P.
 Richard Bagot, Efq. 2 L. P.
 Sir G. Baker, Bart. M. D. Phyfician to the Q. L. P.

b

Rev

- Rev. Mr. Bale, Stud. of Christchurch, Oxf. L. P.
 Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. P. R. S. 12 L. P.
 John Baring, Esq. M. P. for the c. of Exeter, 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Barker, Princ. of Brasenose Coll. Ox. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Barnard, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 The Hon. Daines Barrington, 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. H. Barton, Warden of Merton Coll. L. P.
 A person unknown, by Dr. H. Barton, 40 S. P.
 Rev. Philip Barton, Subdean of Exeter, 10 L. P.
 Mr. Bastard, L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Bathurst, of New Coll. Oxf.
 Edw. Dav. Batson, Esq. L. P.
 C. W. Batt, Esq. 2 L. P.
 J. T. Batt, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Thomas Bayley, of Jesus Coll. Camb.
 Mr. J. Baynes, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. J. Baynes, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Ox. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Beadon, Master of Jesus Coll. Camb. L. P.
 Henry Beavis, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Becke, of Oriel Coll. Oxf. L. P.
 ——— Bell, Esq. L. P.
 Capt. Bellew, Exeter, L. P.
 Thomas Bellew, Esq. Exeter, L. P.
 Mr. T. Belton, of Great Torrington, Devon.
 Mr. Benson, of Jesus Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Scrope Berdmore, B. D. Fell. of Mert. C. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Beridge, of Jesus Coll. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Bernard, late Provost of Eton, 10 L. P.
 Mr. Scrope Bernard, M. A. Stud. of C. C. Ox. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Bisset, 2 L. P.

Charles

[iii]

- Charles Blagden, M. D. L. P.
 Alexander Blair, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Boddam, Fell. Com. Trin. Coll. Camb. L. P.
 W. M. Bogdani, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Bonney, B. A. of Jesus Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Booth, Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
 Mrs. Borlase, of Cornwall. 4 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Borlase, Regis. of the Univ. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Bowen, Fell. of Brasenose Coll. Oxf.
 Foster Bower, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Thomas Boyce.
 Rev. Mr. Bradley, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Dr. Brandé. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Breëks, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 Mr. Egerton Bridges, of Queen's Coll. Camb.
 The Hon. Ch. Brodrick, of Clare H. Camb. L. P.
 Robert Bromfield, M. D. F. R. S. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Brown, Master of Pembroke H. Camb.
 Isaac Hawkins Browne, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Jacob Bryant, Esq. 2 L. P.
 George Buck, Esq. L. P.
 Lewis Buck, LL. D.
 Mr. Buckland, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Benj. Buckler, D. D. Fell. of All S. C. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Buller, Canon of Windsor. 4 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Bulmer, of Jesus Coll. Camb.
 John Burges, M. D. 2 L. P.
 Mr. T. Burges, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Richard Burk, jun. Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Joseph Burrow, Exeter. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Burt, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.

Francis Burton, Esq. 2 L. P.

Charles Butler, Esq. 2 L. P.

C.

Library of Catharine Hall, Cambridge. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Carr. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Chancellor Carrington. L. P.

Mrs. Cartwright, of Exeter. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Caryl, late Master of Jesus C. Camb. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Causley, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.

Edward Chamberlayne, Esq. 2 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Chamberlayne, Fell. of Eton Coll. L. P.

Mrs. Chambers. L. P.

Mr. Henry Chambers. L. P.

Anthony Champion, Esq. 2 L. P.

Earl of Charlemont. L. P.

Mr. Nathaniel Chauncy.

The Lord Bp. of Chester. L. P.

Sir John Chetwood, Bart. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Chevalier, Master of St. John's C. Cam. L. P.

Sir John Chichester, Bart. L. P.

John Chichester, Esq. of Youldston, Devon. 2 L. P.

Library of Christ's Coll. Camb.

Rev. Mr Churchill, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Mr. Chute, jun. Fell. Comm. of Clare H. Camb.

William Clark, Esq.

Mr. Clarke, M. A. Fell. of Caius Coll. Camb.

Lieut. Hamilton Clarke, Exeter. L. P.

Rev,

[v]

Rev. Mr. Cleaver, Fell. of Brasenose Coll. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Euseby Cleaver. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Coates, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. W. Cole, M. A. Fell. of King's Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Collier, Prof. Heb. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Collinson, Fell. of Q. Coll. Ox. L. P.
 George Colman, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Colombine, Norwich. L. P.
 Mr. Conant, Fell. Com. of Trin. C. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Coneybeare. 2 L. P.
 Hon. and Rev. E. Conway, B. A. F. of A. S. C. L. P.
 — Conway, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Cooke, Dean of Ely L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Cooke.
 Rev. Dr. Cooper. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Coulthurst, Fell. Com. of Peterhouse, Camb.
 Peregrine Courtney, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Cracherode, M. A. Stud. of C. C. Ox. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Cranke, M. A. F. of Trin. Coll. Cam. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Craven, B. D. Prof. of Arab. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Crowe, of New Coll. Oxf. L. P.
 John Culme, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. J. Cutler, M. A. Rec. of Droxford, Ha. L. P.
 Mr. Samuel Cutler. 2 L. P.

D.

Rev. Mr. D'Aeth, Rector of Eythorn, Kent.
 Denis Daly, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Dampier, Preb. of Durham. 2 L. P.
 Rev.

- Rev. Mr. Darling.
 Rev. Mr. Davidson, F. of Peter-house, Camb. L.P.
 Rev. Dr. Davies, Master of Eton-School. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Davies, M. A. F. of Trin. C. Camb. L. P.
 ——— Dawkins, Esq. Gent. Com. of C.C. Ox. L.P.
 The Duke of Devonshire. L. P.
 The Dutchess of Devonshire. L. P.
 Mr. Dickenson, of Peter-house, Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Disney. L. P.
 Rev. Fletcher Dixon. L. P.
 Rev. John Dixon.
 Lieutenant Henry Dodd, Exeter. L. P.
 Richard Doidge, Esq. 4 L. P.
 John English Dolben, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Donald, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 Rev. Mr. Done, Fell. of C. C. C. Oxf. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Dowson, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 Edward Drummond, Esq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L.P.
 Robert Hay Drummond, Esq. of C. C. Ox. 2 L.P.
 Richard Rose Drew, Esq. Exeter, 2 L. P.
 Dr. Duck, Norwich. L. P.
 The Lord Viscount Duncannon. L. P.
 Mr. Dunsterville, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.

E.

- Mr. C. Edmonstone, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Edwards, Fell. of Jesus Coll. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Edwards.

Turner

[vii]

Turner Edwards, Esq. of Jesus Coll. Oxf. L. P.
 William Elford, Esq. Plympton. L. P.
 Mr. Eliot, jun. Fell. Com. of Pemb. Hall, Camb.
 Earl of Egmont. L. P.
 Countess of Egmont. L. P.
 Right Hon. Welbore Ellis. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Elston.
 Rev. F. H. Egerton, M. A. Fell. of All Souls Coll.
 Rev. Mr. Empson, M. A. of Cath. Hall, Camb.
 Library of Eton College. 2 L. P.
 Sidney Evelyn, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Everitt, of Trinity Hall, Camb.
 Literary Society at Exeter.
 Mr. Eyton, of Jesus Coll. Oxf. L. P.

F.

Thomas Falconer, Esq. of Chester. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Farmer, Master of Emanuel C. Cam. L. P.
 Mr. Farquharson, of Peter-house, Camb.
 Mr. Filmer, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Hon. and Rev. D. Finch, B. A. Fell. of A. S. C.
 Rev. Mr. Foley, Fell. of Brasenose Coll. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Foot, Rector of Drew, L. P.
 Rev. Mr. J. Foot. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Fosse.
 Rev. Dr. Fothergill, Prov. of Q. Coll. Oxf. 3 L. P.
 Rev. W. Fothergill, M. A. Fell. of Q. Coll. Oxf.
 Mr. T. Fothergill, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 Mr. James Fothergill, B. A. of Queen's Coll. Ox.

John

John Fraine, Esq. Chelsea. L. P.
 Capt. Fraine, Bath. L. P.
 R. Frankland, Esq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Fulham. L. P.

G.

Rev. Mr. Gandy. L. P.
 John Whalley Gardiner, Esq.
 Rev. Mr. Gardiner, Fell. of Catharine H. Camb.
 Dr. Garthshore.
 Edward Gibbon, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Geo. Abr. Gibbs, Esq. of Exeter. L. P.
 Rev. Francis Gisborne. L. P.
 Thomas Gisborne, Esq. 12 L. P.
 Thomas Gisborne, M. D. 7 L. P.
 The Lord Bishop of Gloucester. L. P.
 Dr. Glynn, Fell. of King's Coll. Camb. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Ambrose Godfrey.
 Rev. John Gooch, M. A. of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Gould, M. A. of Cl. Hall. Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Graham, of Netherby, Cumb. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Edw. Granger, Exeter. L. P.
 William Graves, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Green, Chaplain of St. Thomases Hosp.
 Rev. Mr. Greene, Norwich. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Greenfide, Fell. of Cath. Hall. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Gratton, M. A. of Trinity Coll. Camb.
 Hon. Mr. Greville. L. P.

Mrs.

Mrs. Griffith, L. P.
 Mrs. Griffith of Liffon Green. L. P.
 Richard Griffith, jun. Esq. L. P.
 Miss Griffith. L. P.
 Mr. Griffith, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Mr. Christopher Gullet, Exeter. L. P.
 Mr. J. Gunning, Serj. Surg. Ext. to the King. L. P.

H.

Mr. Hailstone, of Trinity Coll. Camb.
 Rob. Halifax, Apoth. to the King's Household. L. P.
 T. Hall, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Hallifax, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.
 William Hamilton, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Hey, of Sidney Coll. Camb.
 Mr. Hamley, Surgeon, at Milbrook. L. P.
 Jos. Chaplin Hankey, Esq.
 Rev. Mr. Hardcastle, Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
 Christopher Harris, Esq. Plymouth. L. P.
 David Hartley, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Harwood, M. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 John Hatfell, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Hawkins, F. C. of Trin. Coll. Camb. L. P.
 Mr. G. Hawkins, Surg. to the K's Household. L. P.
 Isaac Hawkins, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. E. Hawtrey, M. A. Rect. of Monxton, Ha. L. P.
 Mr. Haydon, Bookseller at Plymouth. 2 S. P.
 Mr. Haye, B. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.

[x]

Mr. T. Haye, B. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Heath. 10 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Heath, Master of Harrow School. 2 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Heath, of Eton. L. P.

William Heberden, M. D. 10 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Heberden, Prebendary of Exeter.

Rev. Dr. Hemington, Canon of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Henley. L. P.

Miss Henshaw. L. P.

Bold Fleetwood Hesketh, Esq. of Magd. C. Oxf.

1 L. and 1 S. P.

Rev. Mr. Hill, Tavistock.

Mr. Hill, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Mr. James Hine, Exeter. L. P.

Rev. Mr. William Hole.

Rev. Mr. Hole, Archdeacon of Barnstaple. 2 S. P.

Rev. R. Hole, Rector of N. Tawton, Devon.

Rev. Dr. Hollingberry, Archd. of Chichester. L. P.

Rev. T. Hornsby, Sav. Prof. of Astron. Oxf. 4 L. P.

Mr. J. W. Hoskins, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.

Mr. How, of Peter-house, Camb.

Mr. Hubbersty, B. A. Fell. of Queen's C. Camb.

Rev. Mr. Hughes, Chaplain of the D. Y. Plym. L. P.

W. Hunter, M. D. Physician Ext. to the Q. 20 L. P.

Rev. Mr. Hume, of Westm. School. 2 L. P.

I.

Rev. Dr. Jackson, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 4 L. P.

Rev. Mr. W. Jackson, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.

Gregory Jackson, Esq. Exeter. L. P.

Rev.

[xi]

Rev. Mr. Jackson, of Hertf. Coll. Oxf.
 Miss James. L. P.
 Sir Richard Jebb, Bart. M. D. 2 L. P.
 Benj. Incledon, Esq. 1 L. and 4 S. P.
 Jos. Ingram, Esq. M. A. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
 R. P. Jodrell, Esq.
 Rev. S. Johnes, M. A. Fell. of All Souls Coll.
 Dr. Samuel Johnson. L. P.
 Alex. Johnson, M. D. L. P.
 Library of St. John's Coll. Camb. L. P.
 William Jones, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Jubb, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.

K.

Mr. Keeble, of C. C. C. Oxf.
 Dr. William Keir, Hatton Street.
 Rev. Dr. Kennicott, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Lewis Ker, M. B.
 Mr. S. Kilner, M. A. Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
 Library of King's Coll. Camb. L. P.
 Henry Kitson, Esq. Exeter. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Knipe.
 Francis Knox, Esq. L. P.

L.

Mr. Lambard, M. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Mr. T. Lambard, B. A. Stud. of C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Lambert, Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 The Lord Bishop of Landaff. 10 L. P.

Rev. W. Langford, D.D. Under Mas. of Eton Sc. L. P.
 Sir James Langham, Bart. 10 L. P.
 Christopher Langlois, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Bennet Langton, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Laurence, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Law, Archdeacon of Carlisle. L. P.
 Edward Law, Esq. M. A. Fell. of St. Peter's C. Ca.
 Ewin Law, Esq.
 Rev. Dr. Lee, Warden of Winchester Coll. L. P.
 Hon. W. Legge, M. A. Fell. of A. S. C. Ox. L. P.
 The Lord Viscount Lewisham. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Leigh, Norwich. L. P.
 Literary Society at Lincoln. L. P.
 The Lord Bishop of Litchfield. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Lloyd, Dean of Norwich. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Lort, F. R. S. and A. S. L. P.
 Mr. Lovering, of St. John's Coll. Camb.
 James Luke, Esq. Exeter. L. P.

M.

Edmund Malone, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Manley, Plymouth. L. P.
 Dr. Manning, Norwich. L. P.
 Mr. Mansell, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Mantell, M. A. Fell. of Benet Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Marshall, Mas. of the Free Sch. Ex. L. P.
 Samuel Martin, Esq. 2 L. P.

Rev.

- Rev. Mr. Maffingberd, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. 1 L.
and 1 S. P.
- Rev. Mr. W. Maffingberd, of Magd. C. Oxf. L.P.
- Mr. F. Maffingberd, of Hertford Coll. Oxf.
- Mr. Mathew, LL. B. Fell. of Jesus Coll. Camb.
- Mr. Mathias, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
- Rev. Mr. Emanuel May.
- Lieut. General Melvill. L. P.
- John Merivale, Esq. of Exeter. L. P.
- Rev. Mr. Metcalfe, M. A. Fell. of Christ's C. Cam.
- Rev. Dr. Milles, Dean of Exeter. 2 L. P.
- Thomas Milles, Esq. LL. B. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
- Francis Milman, M. D. L. P.
- Mr. Moneypenny, of Peter-house, Camb. L. P.
- Mr. Moneypenny, jun. of Peter-house, Cam. L. P.
- Rev. Dr. Monkhouse, Fell. of Queen's C. Ox. L. P.
- Donald Monroe, M. D. L. P.
- Fred. Montagu, Esq. L. P.
- Rev. J. Montagu, M. A. Fell. of All Soul's Coll.
- Rev. G. Moore, Canon Residentiary of Ex. 10 L. P.
- Rev. T. Moore, Vicar of St. Veryan, Corn. L. P.
- Earl of Mornington, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
- Rev. Mr. Morrice, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
- Rev. Hooper Morrison, Rec. of Atherington. L. P.
- Cha. Morton, M. D. Princ. Librar. Museum. 4 L. P.
- Mr. C. Moss, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
- Rev. Mr. Mounsey, M. A. Fell. of Jes. Coll. Camb.
- Mr. Tho. Mudge, Plymouth. L. P.
- Mr. J. Mudge, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.
- W. H. Mugglestone, M. B. L. P.

[xiv]

William Mugglestone, Esq. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Murthwaite, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.

Joseph Musgrave, Esq. L. P.

George Musgrave, Esq. L. P.

R. Myddelton, Esq. Gent. Com. of C. C. Ox. L. P.

W. Myddelton, Esq.

N.

Mr. Nation, Exeter. L. P.

Christopher Nevile, Esq. 2 L. P.

Mr. Nevile, M. A. late Fell. of Jes. Coll. Ca. L. P.

Sir Roger Newdigate, Bart. L. P.

Mr. Newnham, M. A. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Rev. Mr. J. Newte, Fell. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

John Nicolson, Esq. of Carlisle.

Rev. Dr. Nicolson, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Ox. L. P.

Anth. Norris, Esq. of Barton, Norfolk. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Norris. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Nowell, Principal of St. M. Hall. Ox. L. P.

Rev. Cradock Nowell, St. Mary-hall, Oxf. L. P.

Nicholas Nugent, Esq. L. P.

O.

Thomas Okes, M. D. of Exeter. L. P.

Mr. Oliver, Fell. Com. of Clare H. Camb. L. P.

Paul Orchard, Esq. Col. of N. Dev. Militia. L. P.

Dr. Osborn. L. P.

Mrs. Osborn. L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Dr. Owen, Rector of St. Olaves, Hart-Str.
Mr. Owen, of St. John's Coll. Oxf.

P.

Rev. Mr. Paley, Prebendary of Carlisle.
John Palmer, Esq.
John Paradise, Esq.
Rev. Mr. Parkinson, M. A. Fell. of Christ's C. Ca.
Rev. Mr. Parminter.
Rev. Dr. Parr, Master of Norwich-School. L. P.
Mr. Parr, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
John Parry, Esq. M. P. L. P.
John Parsons, M. D. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
Mr. Parsons, of Wadham Coll. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. Partington, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
John Peachey, Esq. L. P.
Rev. W. Pearce, B. D. Publ. Orat. of the Univ. C.
Rev. Mr. Peele, Norwich. L. P.
Granville Penn, Esq. of Wadham Coll. Ox. L. P.
Dr. Pennington, of St. John's Coll. Camb. L. P.
Lucas Pepys, M. D. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Percy, Dean of Carlisle. L. P.
Mr. T. Percy, of Emanuel Coll. Camb. L. P.
Edward Peter, Esq. of Trinity Coll. Oxf.
The Lord Bishop of Peterborough. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Pett, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
William Pitcairn, M. D. Prof. R. Coll. Phys. 4 L. P.
Mr. Pitfield, of Exeter, 2 L. P.

Rev.

[xvi]

Rev. J. Plumptre, M. A. Vicar of Stone.
 Edward Poore, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Popple, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Porter, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 The Dutchess Dowager of Portland. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Postlethwaite, M. A. Fell. of Tr. C. L. P.
 W. M. Praed, jun. Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Preston, M. A. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 Major Price, of the King's own Dragoons.
 Rev. R. Price, LL. B. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Pritchett, Fell. of St. John's Coll. Camb.
 Robert Prudom, Esq. of Exeter.
 Mr. Putt, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Q.

Rev. Nut. Quicke, Chan. of the Ch. of Ex. 2 L. P.
 Andrew Quicke, Esq. of Ethy, Cornwall. L. P.

R.

Mr. Radcliffe, of Trinity Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Dr. Randolph, President of C. C. C. Ox. L. P.
 Francis Randolph, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Randolph, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Randolph, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Randolph, of Magd. Coll. Oxf.
 Mr. Rastall, M. A. Fell. of Jesus Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Mr. Ratcliffe, Fell. of Brasenose, Coll. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Rawes, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.

Mrs.

[xvii]

Rev. Mr. Raynes, M. A. Fell. of Jesus Coll. Camb.

Dr. Remmett, Physician at Plymouth. L. P.

The Rev. Mr. Rennell. 2 L. P.

Mrs. Reynolds. L. P.

Sir Joshua Reynolds. L. P.

H. R. Reynolds, M. D. L. P.

Ambrose Rhodes, Esq. of Bellair, Devon. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Rhudde, Vicar of Shepherd's well, 2 L. P.

Rev. C. Richards, B. A. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Robert Richardson. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Richardson, Minis. of St. Cuthbert's, Carl.

Rev. H. J. Rickman, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Right Hon. Lord Rivers. 2 L. P.

Mr. Roch, of Barnstaple.

Rev. Mr. Rogers, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.

Giles Rooke, Esq. Serjeant at Law. L. P.

Mr. Rookes, Fell. Comm. of Jesus Coll. Camb.

Walter Ruding, M. D. Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.

S.

Theoph. R. Salway, Esq. B. A. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Sandby, Chanc. of Norwich. L. P.

The Lord Sandys. 2 L. P.

Mr. William Sanford, Exeter. L. P.

Mr. George Savage, M. A. Fell. of King's C. Camb.

Sir George Savile, Bart. 6 L. P.

Mr. Saunders, B. A. Fell. of Queen's Coll. Camb.

Dr. Saunders. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Schomberg, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.

d

Alex.

- Alexander Scot, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Seger, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. W. Segrave, B. D. of Trinity Coll. Oxf.
 ——— Seward, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Shepherd. 2 L. P.
 R. B. Sheridan, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. William Sharp. 20 L. P.
 Humphrey Sibthorpe, Esq. L. P.
 J. Sibthorpe, Esq. M. A. Ratcl. Fell. U. C. Ox. L. P.
 Rev. Ja. Simons, Rect. of St. Stephens, Exeter.
 Rev. Jo. Simons, of Heavitree, Devon. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Siffon, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. .
 Rev. Mr. Skinner, of Baffingham. L. P.
 The Lord Chief Baron Skynner. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Skynner, Præcentor of Exeter. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Sleech, Archdeacon of Cornwall. L. P.
 Mr. Sloley, Caius Coll. Camb.
 Rev. Dr. Smallwell, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
 John Smith, M. D. Sav. Prof. Geom. Oxf. L. P.
 Dr. Hugh Smith, Hatton-street.
 Rev. Mr. Snell.
 John Speare, Esq. of Exeter. L. P.
 Earl Spencer. L. P.
 Countess Spencer. L. P.
 Rev. Leigh Spencer, M. A. Fell. of A. S. Coll.
 Rev. Mr. John Spurway. 4 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. William Spurway.
 Rev. Mr. Squire.
 George Steevens, Esq. 10 L. P.

[xix]

John Stephens, Esq. of Coaver, Devon. L. P.
 Mr. Stephens.
 Rev. Mr. Stephenfon, M. A. Fell. of C. H. Ca. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Stevens.
 Rev. Dr. Stinton, Chanc. of Lincoln. 20 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Stinton, Fell. of Exeter C. Oxf. 10 L. P.
 Richard Stonehewer, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Storer, Norwich. L. P.
 The Lord Viscount Stormont. L. P.
 Rev. Humphrey Sumner, M. A. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Sweet.
 Dr. Symonds, Prof. Mod. Hist. Camb. L. P.

T.

Rev. Mr. Tapps, Norwich. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Tarrant, Dean of Peterborough. 2 L. P.
 Edward Taylor, Esq. L. P.
 John Taylor, M. D.
 Rev. Mr. Templeman, Rect. of Shafton St. Ja. Dor.
 Sir Noah Thomas, M. D. Physician to the K. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Thomas, Lect. of St. Olaves, Hart-street.
 Sir John Thorold, Bart. L. P.
 Mr. Todd, Bookfeller, at York.
 Colonel Townfend.
 Hon. and Rev. J. Tracy, D. D. Ward. of A. S. C. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Trimenhere, of Trin. Coll. Camb.
 Fiennes Trotman, Esq. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Tutté, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Turner, M. A. Fell. of P. H. Camb. L. P.

[xx]

Richard Turtón, M. D. Phys. Ext. to the K, L. P.

Mr. R. Cooke Tylden, of Jesus Coll. Camb.

Mr. Tyrwhitt,

Rev. Mr. Tyrwhitt, of Wickham, Essex. L. P.

Rev. Mr. R. Tyrwhitt, M. A. Jesus C. Cam. L. P.

Mr. T. Tyrwhitt, Stud. of Chr. Ch, Oxf. L. P.

Richard Tyfon, M. D. L. P.

V.

Rob. Vanfittart, Esq. LL. D. Fell. of A. S. C. & S. P.

William Vivian, M. D. Reg. Prof. Med. Oxf. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Vyse, F. R. S. and A. S. L. P.

W.

Rev. Mr. Wall, M. A. Fell. of Christ's Coll. Camb.

Rev. Mr. Wall. L. P.

Mr. Warburton of Jesus Coll. Camb.

Dr. Waring, Lucas. Prof. of Math. Camb.

Mr. Warre, of Jesus Coll. Camb.

Richard Warren, M. D. Med. Reg. L. P.

Rev. Dr. Warton, Master of Winchester-school.

Rev. Dr. Watson, Reg. Prof. of Divinity, Cam. L. P.

Sir Charles Watson, Bart. M. A. F. of A. S. C. L. P.

Rev. Benjamin Webb. L. P.

William Webber, Esq. & L. P.

Hon. Tho. Wenman, LL. D. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.

Earl of Westmoreland. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Weston, Prebendary of Durham. L. P.

Rev. Stephen Weston, Rector of Mamhead, Devon.

Rev.

- Rev. Mr. Weston. L. P.
 Rev. Dr. Wheeler, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
 Mr. Whicher, C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Samuel Whitbread, Esq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 James White, Esq. of Exeter. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Whitehurst, of Ickleford, Hertfordshire.
 Mr. Whitehurst, of Catharine H. Camb. L. P.
 Mr. Whitehurst, of Peterhouse, Camb. L. P.
 Rev. Jo. Whitfeld, Rect. of Bideford, Devon.
 Mr. W. Wickham, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
 Ralph Willet, Esq. L. P.
 Mr. Williams, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
 Mr. W. Wilshire, jun. of Hitchin, Hertfordshire.
 Rev. Dr. Wilfon, Canon Residentiary of St. Pauls.
 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Wilfon, M. A. Fell. of Christ's C. Camb.
 Mr. Benjamin Wilfon. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Wilfon, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
 The (late) Lord Bishop of Winchester. 2 L. P.
 John Withers, Esq.
 Rev. Mr. Wodehouse, Prebend. of Norwich. 2 L. P.
 Michael Wodhull, Esq. L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Wood, Fell. of Cath. Hall, Camb.;
 William Woodeson, Esq. Viner. Prof. Oxf.
 Mrs. Woodifield. 2 L. P.
 Rev. Mr. Worth. L. P.
 Daniel Wray, Esq.
 Sir Cecil Wray, Bart. 2 L. P.
 William Wright, Esq. L. P.
 J. E. F. Wright, Esq. L. P.

Richard Wright, M. D. L. P.

Mr. Wyatt, M. A. Fell. of Pemb. H. Camb. L. P.

Joseph Wyndham, Esq. L. P.

Rev. Luttrell Wynne, LL. D. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.

Y.

Rev. Dr. Yates, Mast. of Cath. Hall. Camb. L. P.

Edward Roe Yeo, Esq. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Duke Yonge. L. P.

The Lord Archbishop of York. 2 L. P.

Mr. C. Young, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.

Right Hon. Lord John Cavendish. L. P.

Sir John Duntze, Bart. of Rockbere, Dev. 2 L. P.

Michael Morris, M. D. 2 L. P.

DISSERTATION I.
ON THE
GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

DISSERTATION I.

ON THE

GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

THE assertion of HERODOTUS *, “ that the Theology of the Greeks was no older than the times of HOMER and HESIOD,” is, I think, fully overthrown by PAUSANIAS, whose researches into the antiquities of his country were much more profound and exact, than those of any other writer that is come down to us. HERODOTUS in particular, who had travelled into

* L. II. c. 53.

several neighbouring countries, to collect materials for those parts of his history, appears not to have been equally attentive to the ancient traditions of Greece. Of the kings of Lacedæmon he has given a very erroneous list *; and in respect to the age and family of LYCURGUS † is contradicted by every other writer. Nor are there any traces of his having perused several ancient Poets and Genealogies, which appear to have been extant even in the time of PAUSANIAS. This latter quotes a verse from PAMPHOS ‡, a writer of Hymns, which mentions the two different attri-

* Herod. VIII. 131.

† Herod. I. 65.

‡ Pausan. p. 577. Ed. Kuhn.

butes

MYTHOLOGY. 3

butes of NEPTUNE, his being the author of Chariots and of Ships. And PAMPHOS he affirms to have lived not only before HOMER, but before the Trojan war, and even before NARCIS-SUS *, whom OVID makes contemporary with TIRESIAS †.

Besides, the very perusal of Homer shews, in my opinion, that he was not the author of his Mythology; as he never attempts to explain it, but supposes his reader, or rather his hearer, sufficiently acquainted with it. To which add, that several of the Græcian temples

* Pausan. p. 773. Ed. Kuhn.

† Metam. III. 340. seq.

4 ON THE GRÆCIAN

were in being long before HOMER, particularly that of DIANA at Aulis in Boeotia, which PLINY informs us * was *seculis aliquot ante Trojanum bellum ex-ædificata*.

There seems to be just as little reason for the assertion of others, that a part of Greece, and particularly Athens, was peopled by Colonies from Ægypt. This opinion is countenanced by STRABO † and DIODORUS ‡ SICULUS ; but the first broacher of it, I believe, was the Historian THEOPOMPUS. So says Proclus § ; and

* L. XVI. c. 40.

† Strabo, L. VII. p. 321.

‡ Diod. Lib. I. c. xxviii. 9.

§ In Platon. Timæum, p. 30.

also,

also, that he was flatly contradicted by others, who charged him with spreading this story out of mere prejudice. The Athenians also, as we learn from LUCIAN *, considered it as the height of paradox to talk of CROCUS as a foreigner. Let us consider the authorities therefore as equal, and weigh the story according to probability. We know a good deal of the Ægyptian customs, though not much, with certainty, of their history. The Græcian customs we know still better. Now between these two there is a total diversity. The Ægyptians were circumcised: the Greeks held that prac-

* Περὶ ἀποφράδος. II

tice in contempt and derision. The Ægyptians indulged themselves in a plurality of wives. The Greeks were permitted to have no more than one; and of this law CECROPS, the pretended Ægyptian, was the author. In Ægypt, according to SOPHOCLES*, weaving and other domestick business was carried on by the men; and the care of providing food was left to the Female. In Greece the contrary and more rational custom prevailed. In Ægypt it is said to have been a rule, that the Son should follow his father's profession: In Greece no traces of such a rule are to

* Oed. Colon. 330. Philochorus, ap. Scholiast. *ibid.*

be found. The Ægyptians worshipped Animals and Plants; the Greeks despised and ridiculed this superstition. The Ægyptians paid a scrupulous attention to nativities and the aspects of the Planets: In the Græcian History, among the various ways of enquiring into futurity by oracles, the flight of birds, inspection of entrails, and the like, there is not a single instance of any attempt to calculate nativities. Lastly, the Ægyptians were particularly studious to preserve the dead body from dissolution by their careful and costly method of embalming; whereas the Greeks, by committing it immediately to the Fire, seem to have

been desirous of promoting its dissolution.

Now, if Greece was not peopled by colonies from Ægypt, according to the assertion of THEOPOMPUS, we have no authority for rejecting on that pretence the traditions of the Greeks with respect to their own origin. And these inform us, that the bulk of the nation were indigenous; the offspring, if I may so speak, of the soil; and that the first foreign settlers among them were DANAUS, PELOPS, and CADMUS.

After this it is perhaps needless to refute another assertion of

HE-

HERODOTUS * “ that the Greeks
 “ received the names of their
 “ Gods from the Ægyptians.”
 For if he meant to say, that Ho-
 MER borrowed from the Ægyptians
 that Theology, or list of Gods,
 which he published in Greece,
 this has already been refuted
 upon the best authority. And
 if he meant that the Greeks re-
 ceived that list from the Ægyp-
 tians at some earlier period, then
 he contradicts himself, and de-
 serves no credit either for the one
 or the other.

But, to put HERODOTUS for the
 present out of the question,
 what foundation is there for say-

* Herod. ll. 4.

ing that the Greeks received the names of their Gods from the Ægyptians? Is THOTH the same name as HERMES *, or ARSAPHES as DIONYSUS †, or ARUERIN as APOLLON ‡, or NEPHTHEN as APHRODITE §, or NEITH as ATHENE ||? There were indeed such cities in Ægypt as DIOSPOLIS, HELIOPOLIS, and PANOPOLIS; but were these names used by the Ægyptians, or *only* by the Greeks? Most certainly the latter; because I find, in THEOPHILUS of Antioch, that the Ægyptian word

* Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 303. Ed. Par.

† Plut. de. Isid. & Osir. p. 365. Ed. Frankf.

‡ Plut. ibid. p. 355, 6.

§ Plut. ibid.

|| Plato in Timæo, p. 21. 1043. Ed. Ficin.

for

for HELIOPOLIS was ON *; and in DIODORUS SICULUS, that PANOPOLIS was called by the Natives CHEMMO †.

But if not the names, perhaps they derived the division and attributes of their Gods from Ægypt. This is a thing much more difficult of proof. It seems not impossible, that several nations, not communicating with one another, might have each of them a supreme presiding God; a God of War; a God of Love; a God of Love; a God of Eloquence, and so forth. Afterwards, when an intercourse is

* Theophil. ad Autol. III.

† Diod. Sic. Lib. I.

begun,

begun, they each expect to find their own Gods worshiped under some denomination, or other, by the stranger nation, and therefore readily find out the points of resemblance. Thus, when the Latins and Greeks began to converse familiarly together, they soon discovered a general resemblance between *ATHENE* and *MINERVA*; between *APHRODITE* and *VENUS*; between *ARTEMIS* and *DIANA*; although the attributes of the Latin Deities (such attributes, I mean, as were assigned them by popular superstition) are far from corresponding exactly to those of the Græcian. However, there was similitude enough to encourage the Latin

Poets

Poets to apply to their own Deities every thing, without reserve, that had been said of the Græcian. And hence in process of time they came to be considered as identically the same. But that the Romans did not borrow their Gods from the Greeks appears from this circumstance, that many of the Græcian Deities * have no correspondent Latin Deities ; and many of these latter † have no archetype among the Gods of Greece.

In confirmation of this we may observe, that the Greeks were sagacious enough to find

* Latona, Priapus, Hecate.

† Janus, Vertumnus, Flora, Pomona.

out their own Gods in Persia, notwithstanding the known contrariety of the two religions. The Persians, we are told *, worshiped JUPITER under the name of OROMASDES; HADES, under the name of ARIMANIUS †; VENUS, under the name of MITRA; and DIANA, under the name of ANITIN ‡. It was the same thing with respect to the Romans and the Gauls. The hierarchy, and the many peculiar superstitions of the Druids, are so totally foreign to every thing we know of the Romans, as to pre-

* Aristot. apud Diog. Laert. in Proœmio.

† Herodot. I. 131.

‡ Plut. in Artaxerxe, p. 306. Agathias, II. p. 45. Ed. Venet.

clude

clude every idea of one nation having borrowed from the other. Yet CÆSAR does not hesitate to say *, that the Gauls worshiped APOLLO, MARS, JUPITER, and MINERVA ; meaning, I suppose, certain Gods corresponding in their attributes to those so denominated by his countrymen. The Gods of Scandinavia in later times were consubstantiated in like manner with the Gods of Latium. No one, I imagine, will pretend that their THOR, and WODEN, and FRIGA, were the copies of JUPITER, MERCURY, and VENUS. And yet when the Goths came to intermix with the Romans, they found resem-

* De Bell. Gall. VI. 15.
blance

blance enough between their Gods to translate one of those words by the other: which custom appears to have been so universal, that we have no other way of rendering WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, and FRIDAY into Latin, but by calling them DIES MERCURII, JOVIS, and VENERIS.

Such an imperfect resemblance as this might possibly obtain between some of the Ægyptian Gods and some of the Græcian. But that this resemblance was general, or in any case so exact as to indicate imitation, I see no reason to believe. What traces have we among the Greeks of the worship of CROCODILES,
and

and SERPENTS? of the Bull APIS, or the Dog ANUBIS? Has not VIRGIL * expressly set the Ægyptian Gods in opposition to the Græcian? and would he have done this, if the former had been archetypes of the latter, or even if the opposition between them had not been striking?

Upon the whole, therefore, we have the best reason to conclude, first, that the Greeks in general were an indigenous people, *αὐτόχθονες*: and, secondly, that their RELIGION and MYTHOLOGY was radically, if not entirely, their own. And now having cleared the ground, I

* Æneid. VIII. 698.

shall endeavour to place that MYTHOLOGY upon its proper foundation.

This intricate subject will, I think, be better understood, if we divide the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY into two classes; that which is essential, and that which is accessory. The essential I would call the worship of the SUPERIOR GODS, such as SATURN, JUPITER, NEPTUNE, PLUTO, APOLLO, MARS, MERCURY, VULCAN, BACCHUS, JUNO, PALLAS, CERES, DIANA, VENUS, CYBELE. These may be considered as so many allegorical personages, representing either the great divisions of Nature, as the Heaven or up-
I
per

per sky, the Air, the Sea, the Earth, the subterraneous world; or else those operations and qualities, which have a more particular influence upon the Animal world and upon Society. Of this latter kind are the propagation of Animals, Tillage, Handicrafts, War, the art of Music, Divination, Hunting, and the Palæstra. The particular divinities presiding over each of these departments need not be pointed out to the classical reader. The only one liable to be mistaken is that of JUNO, who has been thought by some to represent the earth: a false notion, founded, I apprehend,

upon these verses of VIRGIL *:

*Tum Pater omnipotens fœcundis
imbribus æther*

*Conjugis in gremium lætæ de-
scendit——*

Whereas VIRGIL seems here to have had neither JUPITER nor JUNO in his eye, but to have alluded to the more ancient fable of Οὐρανός and Γῆ, as expressed in a fragment of the OEDIPUS of EURIPIDES:

Ἐρᾷ δ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἔρᾶνός, πληρέμενος
Ὀμβρὸς πεσεῖν εἰς γαῖαν Ἀφροδίτης ὑπο.

which LUCRETIVUS † has also adopted :

Postremo pereunt imbres, ubi eos

PATER ÆTHER

* Georg. II. 325.

† Lib. I. 251.

*In gremium MATRIS TERRÆ
præcipitavit.*

According to PHILO JUDÆ-
US *, JUNO is not the Goddess
of the Earth, but of the Air:
Ἦραν δὲ τὸν αἶρα, καὶ τὸ πῦρ Ἦφαι-
στον, καὶ ἥλιον Ἀπόλλωνα—μυθογράφοις
παρέδοσαν. Even the more mi-
nute parts had their appropriated
Gods, though of inferior rank
and power, in proportion as the
substance to which they were
annexed was of a greater or less
consequence in the visible world.
Rivers and brooks from the per-
petuity of their stream naturally
excite wonder; and that wonder
soon begets an idea of divinity.

* Philo Jud. p. 513. Ed. Turn. See also
Cic. de Nat. Deor. II. c. 26.

But the River from its superior magnitude being a more awful object was put under the tutelage of a more important and masculine God; whereas the Brook, which suggested only pleasurable ideas without any mixture of terror, was supposed to derive its origin from a tender Female. Nymphs, that is, Goddesses of inferior rank, were in like manner considered as inhabiting and protecting Trees, whose apparent life was naturally enough attributed to the power of an inherent Deity.

These I consider as the essential parts or *stamina* of the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY. The
accessory

accessory consist of either some wonderful *phænomena* of Nature, or of some extraordinary Historical Facts, told in an allegorical manner, and improved into miracles. I shall give some clear and undoubted instances of both sorts, which will furnish the reader with a clue to interpret the rest.

Among natural *phænomena* there is hardly any more awful than that of volcanoes, or burning mountains, in their ordinary state; but in a time of violent eruption they become tremendous. It may be suspected that the ancient fable of the Giants attacking the Gods was only an

C 4 allegorical

allegorical picture of those eruptions, which by the great quantities of melted minerals and ashes which they throw up, seem in effect to be making war against heaven. This notion is strongly countenanced by Strabo*; who informs us, that the part of Cilicia, where Typhon was supposed to reside, is called *Katakekaumene*, or the Burnt Country, from the cineritious appearance of the earth. The commotions and occasional eruptions of Ætna are attributed, we know, to Typhon and Briareus in another way. Those *phænomena* not ceasing even in the later ages, the Poets were no longer able to impute

* L. XII. p. 579.

them

them to the war of the Giants against JUPITER, because that would have implied that the Giants were still unconquered, and in a condition to renew the attack. They therefore give the story another turn; and tell us, that one or other of those Giants is buried under Ætna, and produces a fresh commotion of that mountain as often as he changes his posture of lying on his right or left shoulder. The *Solfatara*, or Burning Country, near Naples, is accounted for by the giants being buried there*, and the thunder yet unquenched sending up a vapour through the crevices of the earth: though

* Strabo, l. V. p. 248.

others

others indeed go so far as to say, that this was the true scene of the giants' war. Now, as we find that volcanoes, and countries abounding with natural fire, were attributed one way or other to giants, it is no extravagant conjecture to suppose, that the very existence of giants was originally built upon these *phænomena*.

This however is not the only fable, to which volcanoes have given rise. In one or two instances, where the discharge of flame has been moderate and equable, the cavity of the mountain has been considered by the Poets as the workshop of VULCAN. The island of Lipara is one
of

of these shops ; and Mosyclus, a hill in the Island of Lemnos, another. The latter is thus described by VALERIUS FLACCUS * :

Ventum erat ad rupem, cujus pend-
dentia nigris

Fumant saxa jugis, coquiturque
vaporibus aer :

Substitit Æsonides : atque hic Re-
gina precari

Hortatur, caussasque docens, hæc
antra videtis,

Vulcanique, ait, ecce domos.—

It is well known that several small Islands have been protruded from the bottom of the Sea by volcanoes, which protrusion has in some cases been effected gra-

* Lib. II. v. 336.

dually,

dually, and in others by a single eruption. If we suppose the Island of Delos to have continued a considerable time about the level of the sea, it would of course be sometimes visible to the mariner, and sometimes invisible, according to the calmness or roughness of the water. It is possible also that the top of the Island, after being some time above the surface, might sink down below it for want of support, as the new-formed hills about Vesuvius not unfrequently do. In either way the appearance of the island at one time, and its disappearance at another, sufficiently accounts for the fable of its swimming from place to

to place. That this Island was formerly under water, and discovered by the gradual washing of the sea, is affirmed by PHILO *, upon the authority of ancient Histories. This sufficiently justifies my interpretation of the fable ; though its final appearance is, I think, better accounted for from the operation of a volcano, especially as it was not a flat Island, but had a considerable eminence upon it, called Cynthos.

Earthquakes were common in Greece, and were attributed in their Mythology to one general

* Περὶ ἀφθάρς. κόσμ. p. 658. Ed. Turneb.

cause,

cause, the elevation of the earth by the trident of NEPTUNE. There is however one fable which appears to have a direct reference to them, though not explained in that manner by Mythologists. TANTALUS, the King of Phrygia, and father of PELOPS, resided in a city called Sipylus, situated upon a mountain of the same name*. This City was either entirely thrown down, or greatly damaged, by an earthquake during the reign of TANTALUS; who, after that, we may suppose, lived in continual dread of the like event. The punishment therefore which the Poets contrived for him after

* Strabo, L. I. p. 58. L. XII. p. 579.

Death,

Death, that he was every moment in dread of being crushed by a stone that hung over him, is nothing more than the situation in which every man must live, who has experienced, like TANTALUS, the horrors of an earthquake.

The story of DEUCALION'S Deluge I do not consider as a fable; and I likewise think it had no reference to the deluge of NOAH. It cannot be the latter, because the time of it is specified in the Græcian Chronology *, according to which there must have been an interval of at

* Clem. Alexand. Strom. I. p. 321. Ed. Per.

least

least a thousand years between the two. The tract of country affected by it is particularly mentioned by ARISTOTLE *. It did not even extend to the Peloponnesus, but was in a great measure confined to the plains of Theffaly. From these circumstances it appears to have been a very distinct event from the general deluge; and the same circumstances furnish also a strong presumption that it was not entirely fabulous.

The burning of the world by PHAETHON must be in part historical, because the Græcian Chronologers, according to CLE-

* Meteorolog. I. p. 32. Ed. Sylburg.

MENS * fixed the time of it to a year. The event, that gave rise to this fable, is universally allowed by Mythologists to have been a long continuance of heat and drought. And the reality of such an event, which is in itself sufficiently probable, receives some confirmation from two or three scraps of History that are come down to us. CALLIMACHUS † says that in former times there was a drought in Ægypt for nine years:

Αἴγυπτος προπάρειθεν ἐπ' ἐννέα κάρφελο
ποιάς.

* Strom. I. p. 332. 335. Ed Par.

† Fragm. CLXXXII. See Hyginus, Fab. LVI.

D And

And a similar tradition is somewhere mentioned by PAUSANIAS, as being preserved in one of the obscure towns of Greece. But whence arose the fable of PHÆTHON driving the chariot of the Sun? It might be suggested by the derangement observed in the common course of nature, and by the improbability, that the Sun, whose ordinary influence is so beneficial to mankind, should, under the management of the same beneficent Governor, become ruinous and destructive. From this seeming contradiction the Mythologist easily extricated himself by the fiction of a new and unexperienced Charioteer. Or if we suppose

with

with PROCLUS *, that this extraordinary drought was occasioned by a Comet, the disappearance or extinction of which, according to PORPHYRY †, was commonly called *κεραύνωσις*, this would shew us, why the Poets describe their PHAETHON as taking such an excentrical course, and finally destroyed by lightning.

The grotesque figures of rocks furnished also some embellishment to the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY. To say nothing of those in the *Fretum Siculum*, which suggested the fable of SCYLLA and her Dogs; there was a re-

* in Timæum, p. 33, 34.

† Ibid. p. 34.

markable one in Mount SIPYLUS, which at a distance presented the lineaments of a Woman in great dejection and drowned in Tears, though upon a nearer view, according to PAUSANIAS *, the resemblance was lost. The Mythologist found no difficulty in naming the person by whose Metamorphosis this rock was produced. NIOBE, the Daughter of TANTALUS, was a native of this very spot; and the severe affliction, which she must have felt from the loss of her numerous progeny, naturally pointed her out as the original cause of this peculiar appearance.

* Attic. p. 48.

PHILOSTRATUS informs us *, that, near the town of Phæstus in Crete, there ran out into the sea a promontory, terminating in a rock, which had the exact form of a Lion. It was natural that such a rock should be supposed to have had some distinguished origin: and accordingly the Inhabitants reported, that this was one of the Lions that anciently drew the car of the Goddess CYBELE. The Boeotians equally ingenious, having in their country two naked rocks, resembling, I suppose, two animals, pretended that one was the Fox of Teumessus, whose destiny it was never to be caught; the

* Vit. Apollon. L. IV. c. 34.

other the Dog of CEPHALUS, whose destiny it was, that nothing should escape from him: which two contrary destinies JUPITER, according to them, reconciled by turning them both into stone *.

There is in Barbary, according to Dr. SHAW, a large plain, or tract of country, scattered over with great numbers of naked rocks, standing erect, and so proportioned their thickness to their height as to carry the appearance of Men. He conjectures, and, I think, with great probability, that this assemblage of natural statues suggested the

* Antonin. Lib. c. 41.

idea of the Inhabitants of Africa having been turned into stone by PERSEUS, when he invaded and plundered the maritime part of that country. Seriphus, a little Island near Argos, where PERSEUS is said to have performed another of those miracles, was equally remarkable for numbers of naked rocks.

There was in the Island of Crete a Plane-tree, remarkable for not shedding its leaves in Winter *. Such a striking exception to the common rule implied of course the action of some divinity: and the reason assigned by the Vulgar was,

* Theophrast. Hist. Plant. Lib. I. cap. 15.

that under this tree JUPITER first obtained possession of the fair EUROPA. This Plane-tree, according to THEOPHRASTUS, grew near a fountain; with respect to which ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS asserts*, that those who sat round it in time of rain were not liable to be wet. A fact which none will believe, requires no explanation. Yet it is worth while to remark the progress of credulity. A natural singularity created first a religious veneration in the beholder, and that in its turn produced a fictitious miracle.

* Antigon. Caryst. cap. 179.

The principles of Chemistry were unknown to the ancients; and therefore, when they met with any mineral spring, instead of analysing it to find out the ingredients from which it derived its properties, they were contented to derive them from the interposition of some Deity, or from some remarkable event of the Mythologic Age. A salt spring in Illyria, according to the popular report preserved by ARISTOTLE, was an act of bounty from HERCULES to the inhabitants of that country. A river in Elis, whose water was foetid, was said to have contracted that foetor from the arrows of HERCULES being washed in it,

it, after having been smeared with the gall of the Hydra: though about this the orthodox of those days were not agreed, as some imputed it to the ablutions used to recover the daughters of PROETUS from their insanity *.

It is pleasant to observe the different use made of the same fact in different ages. A *non-descript* bird or plant is in our days a treasure to the Naturalist, who is happy enough to discover it, and it serves him as a step to ascend into the temple of Fame. The ancient Mythologist applied it to a different

* Pausan. Eliac. I. p. 387.

purpose.

purpose. He commonly found out some unfortunate prince or princess, who sinking under the weight of calamity had been permitted by the Gods to assume this new shape. Thus PAUSANIAS informs us * that the *Epops*, or *Upupa*, was not observed till after the catastrophe of TEREUS; nor the Hyacinth discovered in Salamis till the death of AJAX. Novelties of the same kind may possibly have suggested many similar stories: the appearance of new species of birds being a thing taken notice of, after the age

* Pausan. Attic, p. 40—86.

of

44 ON THE GRÆCIAN
of fables was past, by ANTIGON-
NUS CARYSTIUS * and PLINY.

I come now to lay open the other source of MYTHOLOGY, which consists, as I said, in the perversion of history by allegorical and miraculous accounts of common facts. Of this class one of the most common fables is the deriving the birth of every eminent person from one or other of the Gods. This they were tempted to do for various reasons. In the first place, as our knowledge of Antiquity is limited, and every genealogy must begin somewhere or other, the Genealo-

* Antigon. Caryst. cap. 132.

gift,

gift, when arrived at that point, would be obliged to confess his ignorance of what went before, did he not, by making a God the basis of his list, put a stop to further enquiry. All the Greek genealogies originate in this manner, some from a River, some from NEPTUNE, but much the greater part from JUPITER: by which we are to understand nothing more than that the Genealogist was come to the end of his line, and had no real ancestor to substitute.

A second cause that greatly increased the number of these spurious Gods, was, I suppose, the convenient covering that
such

such a pretence gave to female frailty. The wife or daughter of an ancient Chieftain, who listened to the dictates of love, had this advantage above the modern Beauty, that she had a chance of deriving honour from her gallantries : and if her parents or husband concurred in the fraud, or even if they were unrelenting and sceptical, might still hope to be enrolled among the spouses of the Gods, provided her pretensions were not rendered abortive by an imprudent and unseasonable diffidence. To point out particular instances would be blasting that reputation, which the Ladies of Antiquity wished no doubt to preserve

serve to the latest posterity. But it will be no breach of decorum to observe, that EURIPIDES * mentions it as a common practice of indiscreet young women to extenuate every amorous failing by making some God or other the partaker of it.

The Gods had indeed a set of retainers, who sometimes acted as deputies for them on those occasions. The priests and subordinate officers of their temples, who are represented as leading a life of feasting and drunkenness (ἐν ἑορταῖς αἰεὶ καὶ μέθαις ὄντες †) availed themselves some-

* Ion. v. 1513.

† Schol. in Hermog. p. 226.

times of their connexion with the Deity to obtain possession of a young and beautiful votary. JOSEPHUS * tells a remarkable story of the priests of Isis seducing a Roman Matron of great virtue, by persuading her that the God ANUBIS was enamoured of her, and solicited the honour of her embraces; in whose stead they introduced to her a young Roman, called DECIVS MUNDUS. And according to PAUSANIAS † the inhabitants of Temesa in Italy were enjoined to build a temple to the *manes* of a man who had been stoned to death for a rape, and to of-

* Antiquitat. Lib. XVIII. cap. 3.

† Eliac. II. p. 467.

fer to him every year the most beautiful of their Virgins, upon whom the immortal ravisher appears to have exercised both his lust and his cruelty. This practice continued for a long space of time, till EUTHYMUS, an Olympian Boxer, happening to pass that way, became enamoured of the beautiful victim, and undertook to be her champion, upon condition of becoming afterwards her husband. For a person trained to athletic combats, the inmate of the temple, though a divinity, was no match. He was conquered by EUTHYMUS, and in despair, as the story informs us, threw himself into the sea, and was heard

E of

of no more. These well-attested stories render it probable, that it was not APOLLO, but his priest, that solicited the embraces of CASSANDRA, and that the courtship of Io, so particularly described in ÆSCHYLUS *, was an artful contrivance, similar to that of the priests of Isis in JOSEPHUS, except that the lover of Io was the Priest himself. When any of these plots succeeded, the innocent lady would of course ascribe her pregnancy to the God, by whose name she had been seduced.

The supposed offspring of the Gods were still further mul-

* Prom. v. 645. seq.

tiplied

tiplied by a fourth cause, the admiration which excellence of every kind naturally excites in the world. This was generally thought to denote, or at least it was construed as a mark of, divine parentage; and the particular divinity picked out as the Father, was determined by the nature of the distinction*. A good Archer was reputed to be the Son of APOLLO; and I remember to have seen a passage in some ancient author, where the tradition is accounted for in this very manner. It was probably for skill in divination that IAMUS, the Augur men-

* Eustath. in Iliad. A. p. 14.

tioned by PINDAR *, was supposed to derive his birth from the same God. THEAGENES, an Athlete of remarkable strength, was reported by his countrymen the Thasians to be the son of HERCULES †. The great warrior and the crafty orator were in like manner celebrated, one as the Son of MARS, the other of MERCURY. Excellence in Horsemanship or in Navigation denoted the party to be the Son of NEPTUNE; and extensive dominion, of JUPITER. DÆDALUS, the famous statuary, was celebrated as the son of VULCAN,

* Ol. VI. v. 74.

† Pausan. Eliac. II. p. 477.

and

and APOLLONIUS * mentions one PALÆMONIUS, who attained the same honour on account of his lameness. To call a skilful and fortunate husbandman the son of CERES would have interfered perhaps with a known fact; and therefore the mythologists were obliged to compliment IASION in a different way, by pretending that CERES was so enamoured of him as to admit him to her bed.

The meaning of these fables was probably as well understood as a modern Poet is, who calls his Patron a son of MARS; with this difference, that among the

* Apollon. Rhod. Lib. I. v. 202.

ancients the fact might not be entirely disbelieved. With respect to death, MYTHOLOGY makes no distinction of ranks. Yet in some deaths the Gods were supposed to be particularly concerned. It is observed by EUSTATHIUS *, that Homer attributes the sudden deaths of Men to APOLLO, as of Women to DIANA. It should seem however that this was not wholly confined to sudden deaths, as their arrows are said to have killed the children of AMPHION and NIOBE, who according to PAUSANIAS † died of the plague. CALLIMACHUS ‡ also ascribes the

* Eust. in Iliad. T.

† Boeot. p. 721.

‡ H. in Dian. v. 126, 7,

deaths

deaths of women in childbed to DIANA. Mr. MARKLAND on EURIPIDES * remarks, that it was customary to attribute deaths from any sudden casualty to the passionate regard of some God, taking the beloved object from the world to himself. Thus ORITHYIA, blown, I suppose, from a precipice by the wind, was reported to be carried off by BOREAS; HYLAS, drowned in a fountain, to be pulled in by the Water-nymphs; and AMPHIARAUS, who in the hurry of his flight from Thebes fell with his chariot into a deep chasm, to have been snatched into the bowels of the Earth by

* Suppl. v. 929.

the Gods themselves, as a reward of his virtue. This, as appears from some epigrams and inscriptions, quoted by Mr. DORVILLE *, was the common consolation of every parent and relation, to whom such disasters happened. That accidents from lightning should be imputed to JUPITER, is not to be wondered at, that fire appearing so manifestly to come from heaven. But it is worth remarking, that persons killed in this manner were not always looked upon as objects of the divine wrath. That idea would have been too severe upon their surviving friends; and therefore, though the Mythologists admitted such

* Ad Chariton. p. 258.

a catastrophe to be penal, where the party was obnoxious, yet their general doctrine was, that to be struck with lightning was a mark of the special favour of JUPITER *.

So far we have endeavoured to point out some general principles of MYTHOLOGY. In what follows there is no appearance of any such principle, the transactions of mankind being indeed too anomalous to be arranged into distinct classes. We shall find however, that when any remarkable fact occurred, the invention of the Mythologists was always ready to give it a

* Artemidorus Lib. II. cap. 8.

new and a magnificent colouring.

We will begin with CECROPS, the most ancient of the Athenian Kings. Of him it is reported that he was half a man and half a serpent; which PLUTARCH*, and after him EUSTATHIUS †, suppose to mean, that in the former, or at least one half of his reign, he governed with the cruelty of a barbarian; in the other with mildness and humanity. It was by an allegory of the same kind according to EUSTATHIUS ‡, and, if I mistake

* De ferâ Num. Vindict. p. 551. Ed. Franc.

† In Dionys. Perieg. v. 390.

‡ In Dionys. Perieg. l. c.

not,

not, PLUTARCH also, that CADMUS was reported, after his expulsion from Thebes, to be metamorphosed into a serpent; the fact being no more, than that living among the Illyrians, he lost the humanity of the Greeks and assumed the savageness of that uncivilized nation.

The metamorphosis of the people of Ægina from ants into men is explained by the ancients themselves in a manner equally natural. STRABO * informs us, that the Inhabitants of that Island, to save the trouble of making bricks, were used to dwell in hollows, which they

* L. VIII. p. 576.

dug

dug under ground; a custom that still prevails in Wallachia, and some parts of Poland, where dwellings of that sort are called *Limfinks*. The name of ants, which so naturally suggests itself, and which we can hardly help applying to a nation living in this manner, was converted by the Poets into a serious fiction, that the people of Ægina originated from ants, who afterwards at the intercession of ÆACUS were turned into men. Many other stories of *Metamorphoses* are in like manner founded upon an analogy, that either the character, or situation, of the person had with that of the bird, or beast, into which he was transformed. LYCAON was supposed

supposed to become a wolf, as resembling that Animal in his savage cruelty. MEROPS, king of Cos, was said to be turned into an eagle *, as an emblem, according to ÆLIAN, of his having been a pirate. After TEREUS had been changed into an *Upupa* by the Mythologists, the animosity of that Bird against the Swallow and the Nightingale might possibly suggest the Idea, that PROCNE and PHILOMELA had assumed those shapes. The anxiety of ALCYONE, and her constant waiting on the seashore for the return of CEYX, bore so great a resemblance to the life of a Kings-fisher, that it

* Eustath. in Iliad. ω.

was little more than a metaphor to say she became one. The followers of DIOMEDE, who died of famine on some desert part of the coast of Italy, were said in like manner to be turned into Herons, a bird that lives in the salt marshes upon fish. This probably was the exact situation of DIOMEDE and his Argives in the height of their distress; and therefore their transformation, if understood of this time, was hardly to be called fabulous.

The power ascribed to the fountain SALMACIS, of turning men into women, is thus explained by VITRUVIUS*. That fountain

* Lib. II. cap. 8.

was situated at the very summit of the hill, which overlooked the city of Halicarnassus; a spot originally occupied by the barbarous Carians, who were dispossessed by a colony of Greeks from Argos and Troezen. Unable to defend themselves from this injury, the barbarians endeavoured to revenge it by continual incursions upon their invaders. At last however one of the new settlers opening a shop upon the borders of this fountain, and having furnished it plentifully with all sorts of wares, the barbarians were allured one after another to frequent it; and in consequence of that, says this Author, *e duro feroque*

feroque more commutati in Græcorum consuetudinem et suavitatem suâ voluntate reducebantur. So that the water did not produce effeminacy, according to the common tradition, but only that softness of disposition which we call humanity.

The imprisonment of MARS by OTUS and EPHIALTES furnishes another instance of an historical fact converted into a fable. EUSTATHIUS informs us*, that OTUS and EPHIALTES were two princes, who by their power and the terror of their arms kept all their neighbours in awe, and obliged them to desist from their mutual

* In Iliad. E. v. 380.

invasions and piracies; which in the language of the Poets was putting MARS in prison.

It appears to have been a custom among the Greeks, in building the walls of any new city, to animate the builders, and give an air of festivity to the undertaking, by music. This at least I infer from the manner, in which PAUSANIAS speaks of the music used at the building of the new Messene by EPAMINONDAS *. Hence we may account for what the Mythologists report of AMPHION, that the melody of his lyre was so attractive, that the

* Messen. p. 345.

very stones followed him, and formed themselves spontaneously into a wall furrounding the city of Thebes; by which, I suppose, nothing more is meant, than that the wall was so expeditiously built under his inspection, and to the sound of his music, as if the stones themselves had been animated by it, and arranged themselves of their own accord in their proper places.

The story of DÆDALUS and ICARUS is, I think, well explained by PAUSANIAS*. He tells us, that sails were the invention of DÆDALUS, and first

* Bœotic. p. 732.

used

used to facilitate his escape from MINOS, who was only able to follow him with oars. The success of the invention to the father and son was suitable to the care of the one, and the rashness of the other. The father got safe to the desired port; the son, by carrying too much sail, was overfet and drowned.

It is however but a small part of the Greek Fables that is founded upon domestic facts. The principal of them are ingrafted upon the stories of their four principal Heroes, PERSEUS, BACCHUS, JASON, and HERCULES; who having been engaged, ac-

according to the Poets, in expeditions to distant or unknown countries, their adventures would of course be very confusedly and variously related, and must naturally give great scope for invention and embellishment. Had COLUMBUS, DRAKE, and RALEIGH, lived in times, when writing was little practised, and every thing was preserved in songs; and when moreover there were no maps to assist the memory; it is easy to guess how strangely their exploits would have been related; how many miraculous embellishments they would have received from accident or design; and, lastly, how

Geo-

Geographers, in subsequent times, would have been perplexed to fix the scene of them. If this would certainly have happened where there was a real foundation of truth, it clearly demonstrates, that there may be such a foundation, even where the additional circumstances are impossible or contradictory. A rational enquirer will therefore reject only that part of the story which is variously related; and admit that, if not manifestly absurd, in which all agree. Though he doubts the miraculous adventures of those heroes, he will admit their existence, especially as the traditions, which attest

F 3 this,

this, have also handed down to us an account of their parentage and their descendents.

PERSEUS, if admitted to be a real person, should seem to have been a piratical adventurer, who, having collected together a band of followers, was fortunate enough to succeed in plundering some rich city or temple on the coast of Barbary. His other exploit in Palæstine might perhaps be the rescuing of ANDROMEDA not from a sea-monster, but from another pirate like himself. After this he invaded Argos, pretending to be the Grandson of ACRISIUS, whom he expelled, and reigned
in

in his stead. The story of his mother DANÆ being thrust out to sea in a small boat, with him an infant, and their being afterwards found by fishermen, and carried by them to the neighbouring island of Seriphos, is neither impossible, nor at all unsuitable to the inhumanity of those ages.

BACCHUS, that is, the GRÆCIAN BACCHUS, was an adventurer contemporary with PERSEUS, but of a very different kind. He appears to have been a real person, from the dishonourable circumstance of his having been vanquished in battle by

PERSEUS and the Argives. PAUSANIAS, who has recorded this fact, saw himself the sepulchres of several of the female warriors *. He appears to have been equally unsuccessful against LYCURGUS, when he fled for refuge into the bosom of the sea † ; that is, to his ships. Facts, so little calculated to give lustre, were not likely to have been feigned of a Deity. Against PENTHEUS indeed he had better success, through the indiscretion of that prince in coming either disguised, or without a sufficient escort, to be a spectator of his

* Corinthiac. p. 155.

† Iliad. Z. 135.

private orgies. He seems to have been the first person who thought of attaching the populace to himself by false miracles, and of cementing his connection with them by nocturnal assemblies and revels. By these contrivances he appears to have grown in the end formidable to government in several countries, though never sufficiently powerful to assume it himself.

The word *belief* is too strong to be given to any notions that can be formed of a subject so obscure. But the probability of what I have just now mentioned is rather greater than that this
ad-

adventurer, who was a man of full age when he came to Thebes, should be the son of SEMELE, though it served his purposes no doubt to pretend so. Neither is it necessary to suppose, that he was the same person who conquered India, whose character and name he might assume. In what manner he made his way may be guessed in part from what is recorded in LIVY * of the young man, who first attempted to introduce the Bacchanalian rites into Rome. The detail of this confederacy seems to me to be the best key to the arts of the Theban BACCHUS. It is not im-

* Lib. xxxix. 8.

possible

possible indeed that he might have penetrated into India, through a country, in which there were neither fortifications, perhaps, nor great cities : But if he did, it is more likely that he should have been overpowered and expelled by a fresh confederacy of the inhabitants, than that his retreat should have been purely voluntary.

The story of JASON and his expedition to Colchis is fuller of miracles and contradictions than almost any part of the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY ; and therefore we ought not to wonder that it should be considered by many of the

the

the moderns as an absolute fiction, destitute of any historical basis. Yet the ancients all admit it as a fact; their Chronologers fix the very year in which it took place; and their Geographers, with equal gravity, specify the port from which they set sail, and those which they touched at in their voyage out and home. And 'as to the persons concerned in the expedition, nothing can be more particular than the account given by the Grammarians of their parentage and the places of their residence.

The object of their voyage, as the poets represent it, was truly

ridiculous ; but, as explained by historians, was every way adequate to the difficulty of the undertaking. The fable of the golden fleece, according to STRABO *, took its rise from the method used by the inhabitants of Phasis to entangle and collect the gold dust washed down from the hills ; which was by placing across the rivers a number of sheepskins with the fleeces adhering to them. And this is confirmed by APPIAN *, who intimates that POMPEY the Great, after the defeat of MITHRIDATES, made himself an eye-witness of

* L. XI. p. 499.

† Mithridat. p. 242. Ed. H. Steph.

the

the fact. It was natural therefore for the Greeks to consider the country of Colchis as a sort of Peru, especially when the riches of it were magnified, as no doubt they were, by the marvellous reports of travellers. It was not therefore a *single fleece* that allured them, but the conquest or general plunder of the country. Now this, it is obvious, was not to be effected by so small a number of warriors as one and fifty, which is the highest number mentioned in any of the lists: and we are obliged therefore either to reject the story entirely, or to suppose with CHARAX, an ancient Grammarian,

marian, that, instead of one and fifty mariners, each of these supposed mariners was captain of a separate ship, if not commander of a little fleet. It should seem from STRABO * that they at first penetrated far into the country, which the suddenness of the attack will very well account for ; but their precipitate retreat from Colchis, the formidable fleet sent after them by the natives, their being compelled to take a different course in their return, and the little we hear of the Argonauts afterwards ; all this clearly shews that their success was not per-

* L. I. p. 77.

manent ;

manent; but that they were disgracefully defeated and disappointed of their booty. Had it been otherwise, I think we should have heard more of the *Golden Fleece* after its arrival in Thessaly, than barely what APOLLODORUS says*, that it was presented to PELIAS.

What I have already said will sufficiently obviate one of the arguments, with which Mr. BRYANT has attempted to annihilate the historical basis of this story. He is right in saying, that *the crew of a little Bilander* † could

* L. I. c. 27.

† Analysis, Vol. II. p. 487.

not atchieve so many exploits; defeat armies, build cities, and leave several colonies behind them. This is a point given up by all attentive and critical enquirers, both ancient and modern. Nor is the conquest of Peru by PIZARRO, though effected with a mere handful of men, at all a similar case. Yet it is far from impossible, that the Mythologists, to render the story more interesting and surprising, may have dropped all mention of the *viles animæ*, that constituted the bulk of the army. And this is the more probable, as we find the same thing practised in respect to HERCULES, who is often re-

G presented

presented as having atchieved by personal strength, what he only did at the head of his troops. Thus of the defeating the MINYÆ EURIPIDES says * :

Ὅς εἰς Μινύαισι πᾶσι διὰ μάχης μο-
λὼν

Θήβαις ἔθηκεν ὅμμ' ἐλεύθερον βλέπειν.

Whereas DIODORUS † expressly tells us, that he was not the single actor in this exploit; but accompanied by all the young men of Thebes.

Mr. BRYANT ‡ insists strongly upon the contradictory accounts

* Herc. Fur. ver. 220.

† L. iv. p. 256. Ed. Weffeling.

‡ Analysis, Vol. II. p. 484. seq.

given .

given by different authors of this expedition : which in his idea entirely destroy the credit of the story. But this surely is inevitable in a matter which the poets, who first recorded it, collected only from report, and, where that was imperfect, supplied the deficiency from fancy and conjecture. Before the particulars of Mr. BANKSES voyage round the world were communicated to the public, several different reports were circulated in respect to the countries discovered and visited ; which reports, if suffered to go down to posterity without contradiction, would have formed the basis of

so many different histories. Yet I think posterity would have reasoned ill to have denied the existence of that gentleman, because some had insisted that he returned home by the North, and others by the South, Coast of New Holland. And why might not the Greeks in like manner have full evidence of the existence of JASON, TIPHYS, ANCÆUS and others; and that they failed upon an expedition to Colchis, and returned; without knowing exactly the rivers which they failed down, or the seas and countries which they traversed? The one might be a matter of public notoriety, but
the

the other required accurate information from the mouth of the adventurers themselves.

But Mr. BRYANT * contends, that the ARGO must be a memorial of the *Ark*, because it is said by ERATOSTHENES † to have been *the first ship ever built*; which he truly observes to be inconsistent with what the Greek Poets and Historians have related of the still earlier voyages of CADMUS and DANAUS, to mention no more: and from this inconsistency he again infers, that they knew not the origin of their own traditions. But it should be

* *Analyfis*, vol. II. p. 493. seq.

† *Asterism*. p. 13. ed. Oxon.

observed, that the ancient writers are far from being unanimous in representing the ARGO as *the first ship ever built*. DIODORUS SICULUS tells us *, that it was the first ship that had ever been built of *so considerable a size*; and PLINY the Naturalist †, that it was the first *long ship*. If we only suppose, that the ARGO was *the first ship*, of which any memory or tradition had been preserved, *that sailed from Greece* upon a distant and hazardous expedition, we need not be surprised, I think, to find, that in time it came to be considered, in the popular

* L. IV. p. 285. Ed. Weffeling.

† L. VII. c. 57.

MYTHOLOGY of Greece, as *the first ship that was ever built.*

Mr. BRYANT further says*, that the Argonautic history must have had its origin in some country south of Greece, because the *constellation* ARGO is *not visible in so northern a latitude.* But this argument I apprehend is much more forcibly applied in another place † to combat the *supposition* of Sir ISAAC NEWTON, that the sphere, in which the *constellation* ARGO had a place, was constructed by CHIRON for the use of the Argonauts. To make it of any weight in the present ques-

* *Analysis*, vol. II. p. 497.

† *Ibid.* vol. II. p. 479.

tion, Mr. BRYANT should have shewn, that the *constellation* ARGO was not visible in any country inhabited by Greeks, or where the language, and history, and fables of Greece, were current. On the contrary, he allows himself *, that it was visible in Rhodes, where HIPPARCHUS is known to have made some of his observations; and in Cnidus, the birth-place and residence of the famous astronomer EUDOXUS, whose description of the cœlestial phænomena ARATUS is said to have copied. This argument therefore being put out of the way, I see no reason for attri-

* *Analysis*, vol. II. p. 497.

buting

buting the groundwork of the story to any nation but the Græcians, who claim it. And this is further confirmed by the word *Argo*, which is evidently of Greek origin, being formed from the adjective *αργος*, *swift*, by the same analogy as *Γοργω*, *Κελαινω*, *Καλλισω*, *Αρισω*, and, I believe, some other proper names are from their kindred adjectives.

Before I quit the story of JASON, I will just observe, that there are two fables connected with it, which admit of no very difficult explanation. The HARPIES, who were used to come suddenly, and carry off the food
that

that was set before PHINEUS, were probably pirates, who landed every now and then to plunder the coast; till finally driven away by the two winged sons of BOREAS, who commanded a part of the Argonautic fleet. Perhaps the story of TANTALUS, starving in the sight of his food, may denote, in like manner, the sudden incursions of robbers, who laid waste his country just before harvest. But to wave this. The other miracle, to which I alluded, was, *the speaking keel* of the ARGO, which I take to have been such another juggle as that of SERTORIUS, pretending to receive directions from heaven through the

the means of a doe : which the Spaniards readily believing, obeyed his orders with a blind submission *. But *the speaking keel* might have imposed upon an assembly of mariners in a more enlightened age ; nor did it require any thing to carry on the imposture, but the faculty of speaking inwardly, without opening the lips or teeth, in the manner of the εἰσλατρίμθοι.

The story of HERCULES is more intricate and perplexed than that of any ancient hero whatever ; at the same time that there is very strong evidence of such a person

* Plutarch. Vit. Sertorii.

having

having existed in Greece, and performed many not incredible exploits. The old *historical* Mythologists seem perfectly aware of this, and take care to inform us, that the actions attributed to HERCULES are not all to be understood of the *Theban* HERCULES, but some of the *Ægyptian*, and others of the *Tyrian*; and that all these have been blended together by the *fabulous* Mythologists into one series of events. As *Ἡρακλῆς* has strongly the appearance of a Græcian name, it seems at first view difficult to conceive, how such a name should have been borne by any one in either of those

those nations, whose language was very different, and who were very unlikely to borrow from the Greeks in that very remote period, in which the Tyrian and the Ægyptian chieftain are placed. Nor is it all easy to comprehend, how the actions of one man should be imputed to another, who lived in a remote country above a thousand years later. Yet both these suppositions will perhaps be rendered credible by premising a few reflections. We may recollect then, that among the ancients it was no singular piece of vanity for princes to assume, or suffer their flatterers to confer upon them, the name of
some

some Hero or Demigod, whose character might be supposed to have ever so slight a resemblance to their own. To say nothing of COMMODUS, the Roman HERCULES, whose caprices are no standard of ancient customs: HYGINUS, if I mistake not, somewhere says, that CARANUS, the first of the Argive race who settled in Macedonia, assumed the name of his ancestor HERCULES. The title of BACCHUS was also much coveted. It was assumed by PTOLEMY AULETES, king of Ægypt*; and among the Romans by MARC ANTONY and CA-

* Diod. Sic. Lib. I.

LIGULA *. The northern traditions also inform us, that ODIN, from whom their present history begins, had originally another name, but afterwards assumed that of a more ancient ODIN, of whom no other circumstance is now remembered. In like manner the *Ηρακλης* of the Greeks, who was originally called *Αλκαιος*, or *Αλκείδης*, we may suppose, assumed, or was complimented with, the name of *Ηρακλης*, from the resemblance of his exploits to those of a more antient HERCULES, well known in that age. Hence in process of time, when the memory of the former was

* Eustathius in Iliad. I.

grown

grown obsolete, his actions and adventures were attributed to the latter. But whence comes it then that this foreign hero had a Græcian name, as *Ἡρακλῆς* undoubtedly is, and that not merely a name of Græcian termination, like *Δαρειος*, *Φαρναβαζος*, and many others, but compounded of two genuine Greek words, by the same analogy as *DIOCLES* and *ATHENOCLES*, two names that we meet with in *POLYÆNUS*? This is indeed a hard question to answer, unless we suppose it to be a translation of the Ægyptian word, as *HELIOPOLIS* is a translation of *ON*, and *PANOPOLIS* of *CHEMMO*. *PAUSANIAS* * mentions

* Phocic. p. 836.

one MACERIS, who was surnamed HERCULES by the Ægyptians and Libyans *.

If therefore the son of ALCMENA assumed the title of a more ancient hero, it is not to be wondered that the itinerant poets and rhapsodists of Greece should ascribe to their own countryman all the brilliant actions of his namesake: when even grave historians are sometimes misled by the similitude of names, attributing to the younger AFRICANUS, for instance, what was atchieved by the Elder. Thus then it is possible that the distant expeditions to Africa, Spain, Italy, and India, may

* Phocic. p. 836.

H belong

belong to the older HERCULES, and that the theatre of the Græcian chieftain extended no further than from Greece to Lydia and the Euxine. The words of ARRIAN are very apposite. “I
 “ apprehend,” says he *, “ that
 “ the HERCULES worshiped by
 “ the Iberians in Tartessus (near
 “ which are the so-called pillars
 “ of HERCULES) was the Tyrian
 “ HERCULES † ; because Tartef-
 “ sus was built by the Phœni-
 “ cians, and the temple of HER-
 “ CULES there is constructed, and
 “ the sacrifices also performed,

* De Expedit. Alexandri. II. p. 88.
 Ed. Gron.

† See also Appian. Iber. p. 256. Ed.
 H. Steph.

“ after

“ after the Phœnician manner.
 “ As for GERYONES, against
 “ whom the Argive HERCULES
 “ was sent by EURYSTHEUS, to
 “ drive away his kine, and bring
 “ them to Mycenæ, HECATÆUS
 “ the historian says, that he had
 “ no connexion with the country
 “ of the Iberians ; and that HER-
 “ CULES was not sent to any
 “ island called Erythea in the
 “ Atlantic ocean ; but that there
 “ was a king, called GERYONES,
 “ in Epirus, near Ambracia and
 “ Amphilochia ; and that HER-
 “ CULES drove away the kine from
 “ thence, being itself no mean
 “ labour. With respect to which
 “ I know myself, that Epirus is
 H 2 “ a good

“ a good pasture country, and
 “ breeds excellent kine ; and I
 “ think it not improbable, that
 “ the fame of the kine of Epirus,
 “ and the name of fuch a king as
 “ GERYONES, might be carried
 “ to EURYSTHEUS, but that he
 “ would never have known even
 “ the name of the king of the
 “ Iberians, fituated as they are
 “ at the extremity of Europe, or
 “ the quality of their cattle.” So
 far ARRIAN ; and in fupport
 of this notion we may obferve,
 that though the fon of ALCMENA
 is mentioned in general terms, as
 having cleared the feas of pirates,
 not one of the Græcian writers
 has fpecified fo much as a fingle
 exploit

exploit of that kind. SALLUST also, in his history of the Jugurthine war, mentions an African tradition, that HERCULES died in Spain ; and that, after his death, considerable bodies of Medes, Persians, and Armenians, which had composed part of his army, came over and settled in Africa ; whereas the army of the Argive chieftain consisted of Greeks, and principally, according to PINDAR *, of Tirynthians. When therefore this last-mentioned poet affirms, that HERCULES brought the wild olive-tree (Kotinos) to Elis from the country of the

* Ol. X. 40. Isthm. VI. 40.

Hyperboreans*, which the learned GESNER † supposes to be Portugal, we ought, I believe, to refer the former part of the assertion to the Græcian HERCULES; and the latter, that is, the expedition to Portugal, to the Tyrian, who might also be the person that subdued CACUS the robber, and fought with ERYX.

But how then shall we reconcile this with what SYNESIUS tells us ‡, that in the public registers of the city of Cyrene was recorded, till the invasion of the Barbarians, a list of descendents in

* Ol. III. 25.

† De Phœnic. Navig. Præl. II. § 8.

‡ Opp. p. 302. Ed. Petav.

regular

regular succession from HERCULES to himself? Does not this imply, that the Græcian HERCULES visited Africa, and founded Cyrene? Yet on the other hand PINDAR, who wrote two Odes * to ARCESILAUS, king of Cyrene, gives not the least hint of HERCULES having been there, and much less of his having founded that city. I presume, therefore, that SYNESIUS must mean only, that Cyrenæ, having been settled from the island of Thera, which was a Spartan colony, the first settlers brought with them, and kept memorials of their descent from the kings of

* Pyth. IV & V.

Sparta and their progenitors as far back as Hercules. And this I think will tally sufficiently with what SYNESIUS says, at the same time that it accounts for the silence of PINDAR.

If we suppose, that the son of ALCMENA never failed to Spain or Africa, it will strike off from the list of his labours the acquisition of the Hesperian apples. Of the remaining ten (for the conquest of the triple GERYONES, that is, GERYONES and his two brothers, has been already discussed), of these, I say, the killing of the Nemeæan LION may be literally true; as it is
far

far from impossible, that a strong active man, if lucky enough to give a lion a stunning blow on the head with a heavy club, might easily seize and throttle him, before he recovered from his vertigo. PAUSANIAS even mentions one POLYDAMAS *, who mastered and killed a lion without any weapon at all. The fetching of CERBERUS from hell, PAUSANIAS † explains to mean the destroying of a great serpent, that inhabited a chasm of the earth at Tænarus; which is strongly countenanced by what EUSTATHIUS tells us from other authors (for he does not appear to have read the tra-

* Eliac. II. p. 469.

† Lacon. p. 275.

vels of PAUSANIAS), that CERBERUS was represented by the ancients with the head of a serpent. Nor was this an atchievement unworthy of HERCULES. Serpents are found at this day in the East Indies of an enormous length, from fifty to one hundred and fifty feet : who, except when gorged with food, are greatly an overmatch for any animal. Such a one it probably was that the Roman army destroyed, though not without the help of a catapult, near the river Bagrada*. A serpent of this size, lying at the mouth of a tremendous chasm, might naturally be

* A. Gellius, VI. 3.

called

called *the Dog of Hell*, as the hydra, a supposed serpent, is called by EURIPIDES *the Dog of Lerna* *.

Two or three of the labours of HERCULES appear to be historical facts, disguised by allegory. The story of the HYDRA related probably to some crew of Banditti, who sheltered themselves in the woods and, though defeated and driven from place to place, continually returned, till IOLAUS, setting fire to the woods, compleated their destruction. The STYMPHALIAN birds must also be allegorical, if APOLLODORUS† had

* Herc. Fur. v. 420.

† Lib. II. p. 108.

any foundation for saying, that they took refuge in the woods, to avoid being the prey of *wolves*. As they are reported to have destroyed the grain (*καρπας* *) it is not unlikely, that they might be distressed people driven from their own houses by some powerful enemy, called *wolves* in the fable, and reduced from necessity to become robbers in their turn. The story of their shooting of their wing-feathers like arrows indicates, I think, the nature of the weapons which they used. The story concludes with their being driven from the woods by the terror of a brazen rattle, af-

* Diodorus Sic. l. IV. c. 13.

ter which HERCULES destroyed them with his arrows. This may signify, that he drove them into some ambuscade by a false alarm in the opposite quarter: made perhaps by the clashing of shields and spears.

The STAG run down by HERCULES was probably a man of the name of *Elaphus*, it being common among the Greeks to give the names of animals to men. Thus we find in their writings persons called Λεων, Κριος, Αλωπηξ, Μυς, Λυκος, and therefore why not Ελαφος? As the stag is said to have been consecrated to DIANA, the man I suppose was one
of

of her priests, who had been guilty of some crime. HERCULES was desirous to take him without hurting him; but not being able, after a year's pursuit, according to APOLLODORUS*, to effect this, at last lamed him with an arrow, and delivered him, still breathing, to EURYSTHEUS.

As the son of ALCMENA was never unattended with something like an army, his expedition against the AMAZONS, and that against DIOMEDE, king of Thrace, carry in them nothing marvellous. The sole difficulty here

* Lib. II. p. 103.

arises from the object, which hardly seems to deserve a military equipment. Yet it is not difficult to conceive, that if EURYSTHEUS was solicitous, as we find he was, to improve the breed of his cattle by bringing Heifers from Epirus, he might think it a matter of equal importance to mend the breed of his horses by bringing stallions, or mares, from Thrace. The *girdle* of ANTI-OPE may seem to have been a very trivial consideration; but if by *girdle* was meant a tract of coast, as in the following verse of APOLLONIUS *,

Ακτῆς Θρηϊκῆς ΖΩΝΗΣ ἔπι τηλε-
θόωσαι,

* Argonaut. I. 29.

it

it will not be difficult to discover the end which EURYSTHEUS had in view; as the coast adjoining to the Amazons' country, perhaps under their government, was precisely the place, if not the only place, where iron was forged and manufactured in those remote times; and it was so much the employment and support of the inhabitants, that APOLLONIUS tells us *, they entirely neglected agriculture.

Of the *twelve* labours of HERCULES the only material one unexplained is his cleansing of the AUGEAN STABLES, that is, the

* Argonaut. II. 1004.

fences,

fences, in which AUGÉAS secured his cattle by night, and which are represented as being overfilled with dung, so as to require immense labour to remove it. This however is plainly nonsensical, as AUGÉAS no doubt employed cowherds enough (and very few we know would be sufficient) to remove the dung out of the stalls from day to day. DIODORUS SICULUS tells the story indeed in a peculiar way. According to him *, this was a work of no great difficulty; but he supposes that HERCULES, by way of degradation and ignominy, was enjoined to cleanse these sta-

* Lib. iv. c. 3.

bles of the dung, without any assistance. But this is inconsistent with what all the Mythologists say, that AUGÉAS stipulated to give HERCULES a large reward; which plainly shews the task, whatever it was, to have been of some importance, and too great for the number of labourers engaged in his service. PAUSANIAS relates*, that the country was so covered with dung, as to have been rendered incapable of cultivation. And this indeed may have some foundation of truth in that warm climate, since, according to THEOPHRASTUS, dung without

* Eliac. I. p. 377.

water

water burns the ground. But a further solution of this difficulty is, I think, to be found in PLINY, who informs us *, that AUGEAS, king of Elis, was the first who practised the manuring of lands with dung in Greece. He probably therefore had discovered how much his lands suffered for want of water, and employed HERCULES to remedy the inconvenience: which the latter effected, not by any personal labour, but by setting his soldiers to turn the course of a river, or lay dams across it, so as, one way or other, to overflow the country. The service, it is pro-

* N. H. Lib. XVII. c. 6.

bable, was beyond expectation; as HERCULES demanded, in return for it, the half of his kingdom.

Of the explanations of ANCIENT MYTHOLOGY here given, no inconsiderable number has been handed down by the ancients themselves, and therefore may be considered as standing upon some ground of evidence furnished by authors and records now lost; the remainder are merely conjectures, upon which criticism has its full scope. Considering the fable as an *Ænigma*, the thing required is, to find some probable fact, bearing such
a re-

a resemblance to it, as that the fable shall appear to be only a natural and easy allegory of the truth. The compleat analogy between them is the only evidence of which the case will admit.

DISSERTATION II.

A N

EXAMINATION

O F

SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S

OBJECTIONS

T O T H E

CHRONOLOGY OF THE

OLYMPIADS.

DISSERTATION II.

AN EXAMINATION OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLYMPIADS.

THE Register of the Olympic Games, which is the great basis of the Græcian Chronology, was, I believe, admitted as authentic by all the *Literati* from the revival of letters to the time of Sir ISAAC NEWTON. That most eminent philosopher, after having investigated with success the laws of the material world, seems to have imagined, that the same mathematical knowledge,

ledge, which had enabled him to do this, would be equally serviceable to him in unravelling the difficulties of ancient history, and reconciling the discordant epochas of different nations. In the prosecution of this design he has attempted to shew, that almost all nations have been fond of carrying back their origin to too remote a period; and with that view have falsified their chronology; in particular, that the Græcians, actuated by the same foolish vanity as the rest of mankind, have endeavoured to impose upon the world a fictitious series of Olympic victors.

I must here take the liberty to observe, that the disposition
 I of

of the Græcians to magnify their antiquity, is a thing entirely destitute of proof, any further than it is proved by Sir ISAAC's own book. It ought not therefore to be considered as a principle of argument, being indeed the conclusion to which his arguments tend : for which reason I shall take no further notice of it at present ; but proceed to consider the probability of his grand position, that the first part of the series of Olympic victors is purely fictitious, neither the victors, nor the games themselves, having at that time had any existence.

Now in order that we may the better judge, what degree of credit

dit is due to the list of Olympiads, I will first state what it was ; with the external evidence in its favour. The principal witness is PAUSANIAS, who, in the time of the emperor MARCUS ANTONINUS, travelled over Greece in search of antiquities, and was particularly attentive to those at Elis. He appears to have himself examined the register of the *Olympionicæ* ; for speaking of two statues erected to atone for some unfair practices of a Rhodian wrestler, he concludes thus*.

“ The Elean guides say further,
 “ with respect to these Athletes,
 “ that it happened in the 178th

* Eliac. I. p. 432.

“ Olym-

“ Olympiad, that EUDELUS re-
 “ ceived money from PHILOS-
 “ TRATUS, which PHILOSTRATUS
 “ was a Rhodian. This story I
 “ found contradicted by the re-
 “ gister of the *Olympionicæ* kept
 “ by the Eleans ; for in that re-
 “ gister it is, that in the 178th
 “ Olympiad STRATO of Alexan-
 “ dria in the same day carried
 “ away the prize of wrestling,
 “ and of the Pancratiūm.” In ano-
 ther place*, he tells a remark-
 able story of one LICHAS, a Lace-
 dæmonian, who, at a time when
 the Lacedæmonians were exclud-
 ed from contending in the games,
 entered his chariot in the name

* Eliac. II. p. 454.

of the people of Thebes, and having won the race put a garland upon the driver's head with his own hands. This the Eleans resenting ordered him to be scourged ; which produced an invasion of their country on the part of the Lacedæmonians. " The war being at an end," says PAUSANIAS, " LICHAS erected his " statue here ; but the records " of the Eleans say, that it was " not LICHAS, but the people of " Thebes, that obtained the " prize." In a third passage he says *, " the victory of the sons " of PHIDOLAS is registered in the " records of the Eleans as hav-

* Eliac. II. p. 484.

“ing happened in the 68th
“Olympiad, *and not before.*”

The text has it *περὶ ταύτης*, by mistake for *πρὸ ταύτης*. From these three passages it seems plain, that he had inspected the register himself. I say, register, in the singular number, though PAUSANIAS commonly speaks in the plural, *τὰ Ἡλείων γράμματα*. For if he had meant private memorials kept by the Eleans, he would hardly have said so confidently, as he does in the last quoted passage, that the victory of the sons of PHIDOLAS was registered as in the 68th Olympiad, *and not before*. Besides, in speaking of the 104th Olympiad, at which the Arcadians presided, he
says

says *, “ the Eleans do not enter it ἐν καταλόγῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων,” plainly intimating, that it was one single catalogue, and the public record of the Eleans. If any doubt should remain, it seems to be removed by what he says of EUANORIDAS the Elean †, that having obtained the prize of wrestling at the Olympic Games, and afterwards becoming one of the *Hellenodicæ*, or presidents, he himself recorded the names of the victors. So that here we see it was not only a public record, but the entries in it were made by the president of the games.

* Eliac. II. p. 509.

† Ibid. p. 471.

I thought

I thought it necessary to explain this at large, because we are told by PLUTARCH, in his life of NUMA*, that some objected to the list of the Olympiads, as being published by HIPPIAS the Elean rather late, and from no very certain materials. It appears from PAUSANIAS, an eye-witness, that he had the best materials imaginable; and being a man in high esteem among the Greeks; and greatly entrusted by his own countrymen, though ridiculed by PLATO, it is not to be supposed, that he would publish a mere invention

* P. 130. Ed. Bryan.

K

of

of his own as a copy of their records. Besides, PAUSANIAS, who was upon the spot, and inspected them, gives no hint of their differing materially, or even at all, from the list commonly received. And we may observe, that XENOPHON, who lived in the country of Elis, and in the very next generation after HIPPIAS, cites one Olympiad numerically *, and probably therefore from his list. So that Sir ISAAC is hardly correct in saying †, that the reckoning by Olympiads was not in use among the Greeks till after EPHORUS.

* Hellen. I.

† Chronol. p. 47.

Let us next enquire, whether this register was kept from the very beginning of the Olympiads. And to this also PAUSANIAS bears testimony; for he says *, that from the time that there are uninterrupted memorials of the Olympiads, the first prize given was that of the foot-race, which COROEBUS the Elean won. STRABO also mentions COROEBUS as victor in the first Olympiad †; and ATHENÆUS particularly remarks ‡, that he was by profession a cook. The same PAUSANIAS, speaking of a victory gained in a war by the

* Eliac. I. p. 394.

† L. VIII. p. 544.

‡ L. IX. p. 382.

people of Megara over the Corinthians, which was prior in time to the annual Archons of Athens, subjoins, “but neither
 “were the Olympiads as yet registered by the Eleans* ;” which implies, that they began to do it soon after; and most clearly shews, that a public register was the thing which he meant; since no man could say with confidence, that no private memorials were kept before the time when COROEBUS was victor.

That such a register should be at all corrupted, is highly improbable. It is well known how

* Eliac. II. p. 500.

careful the Greeks were of their archives. Those of the Athenians were kept in the temple of CYBELE, called METROUM, from whence APOLLICON the Grammarian found means to steal some of them, which would have cost him his life, as ATHENÆUS informs us *, if he had not fled out of the country. Even the alteration of records was a capital crime among the Rhodians, as we learn from DION †; though in other places, according to Cicero ‡, it was only punished by fine. That the Elean records

* L. V, p. 214.

† Orat. XXXI. p. 336.

‡ In Verrem.

had ever been altered, we have no reason to think, as no traces of such a crime are to be found in any ancient author.

But what is the alteration which Sir ISAAC suspects, or rather asserts, to have been made? Not merely the crazing of a name here and there, and substituting of another in its stead, but the entire and wilful forgery of about forty Olympiads, that had no real existence *. This bold supposition far exceeds any thing that I recollect in the works of Dr. BENTLEY, whom a great poet has stigmatized with the epithet

* Chronol. p. 122.

of *flashing*. But waiving the boldness, let us consider the probability of it. And here two questions occur; first, what could be the motive? and, secondly, how it could be accomplished?

The motive must be either private or public; private, to gratify the pride of a number of families, by attributing to them Olympic victories which they had never obtained: or public, to increase the reputed antiquity of the Olympic institution. Both these motives, and the first in particular, suppose that the forged Olympiads were to be imme-

diately published and circulated, and not to lie dormant upon their register; for in that case how could the pride of any family be gratified? Supposing therefore this series of forty Olympiads, with the names of their respective victors, to be published, I would ask, as the memory of real victories was always carefully preserved in families, whether the families, to whose pride this sacrifice was made, must not be perfectly conscious, that no such games or victories, as those recorded in the forged Olympiads, had ever existed? And as the victors in forty Olympiads, if all the games were supplied
with

with fictitious victors, must have been very numerous, and, upon the narrowest computation, could not be fewer than forty, the number of families entrusted with this secret must also have been proportionally numerous, much too numerous, in my judgement, to admit of the forgery passing without detection.

The public motive comes next to be considered. Now, as the Eleans, who had the custody of the Olympic Register, did not date their origin, as a nation, from the commencement of the Olympic Games, but carried it many generations further back,
I can-

I cannot comprehend how their vanity could be materially gratified by proving, that this particular institution was set on foot in the fourth century of their political existence, rather than in the fifth or sixth. Or will it be said, that, by carrying back the origin of the Olympic Games, they in effect carried back the original æra of their own history? Even this could be no object to the Eleans, because their history is so intimately connected with that of the petty nations adjoining, that whatever heightens the antiquity of any one must equally heighten that of the others. The whole mass of
Græcian

Græcian history must move together. To increase the number of the Olympiads, could not therefore contribute in the least to set them above the heads of their neighbours, which is the common, if not the only, motive, for pretending to superior antiquity. Of the more distant and barbarous nations, they either knew too little to enter into any competition with them, or else they shewed their indifference for this fancied honour, by readily subscribing, as in the case of the Ægyptians, to the claim of priority, which these last, with great confidence, and perhaps with justice, urged.

We

We are next to enquire into the possibility of imposing such a fiction upon the world. It is evident, that no such imposition could take place, after the time when HIPPIAS the Elean published the list of the *Olympionicæ*, as mentioned by PLUTARCH *. Sir ISAAC says, that he lived in the 105th Olympiad † ; and possibly he might live till that time ; but it appears, that in the time of SOCRATES, whose death happened in the beginning of the 95th, which is no less than forty years before, he had already attained to great fame, honours, and wealth : and therefore the pub-

* Vit. Numæ. l. c.

† Chronol. p. 47.

lication

lication of his list may as properly be fixed to this time, as to any other. Now, according to Sir ISAAC's reckoning, the Olympiad, which we now call the 95th, was in reality the 55th, and the Olympic Games of consequence had only been celebrated about 220 years. It is hard, it is impossible to conceive, that among the Greeks, who had so long had the use of letters, who had many ancient writings preserved among them, and who were so remarkably fond of genealogies, that they, I say, should have so entirely lost all memory of the institution of the Olympiads, as not to know whether they had

had lasted 380 years, or only 220. Set the date of the publication by HIPPIAS higher, and you still increase the difficulty.

This however is far from being all. In the catalogue of the Olympiads, every Olympiad had its particular victors, whose countries, as well as their names, were specified. The memory of an Olympic Victor was so carefully preserved in Greece, it was so precious to the nation, as well as family of the Victor, that, when a new list came out of forty or more Victors that had never been heard of before, what must have been the astonishment
of

of those cities and countries upon which this honour was so generously conferred by the Eleans? Must they not have seen through the imposture at once? and, if not at once, how could it escape detection, perfect and complete detection, for so many centuries together, in a nation abounding with criticks? For that the list was published without any chafins we have undoubted proof, because the names of all the Victors in the *Stadium* are come down even to us, and many of them also are mentioned by more authors than one, who all agree as to the date of the victory.

The

The imposture, if it took place at all, must relate entirely to the first Olympiads; because the nearer it approached to the time of publication, the more certainly it would be detected. Now, the authenticity of those Olympiads is still further corroborated by a variety of little circumstances preserved in PAUSANIAS, no way necessary to the supposed fraud, and therefore not likely to have been invented. We are told for instance *, that the first prize was that of the *foot-race*; that in the fourteenth Olympiad that of the *Diaulos*, or *double foot-race*, was added; that in the eighteenth they re-

* Eliac. I. p. 394.

vived the *Pentatblon* and the game of *Wrestling*; that in the twenty-third the prize of *Boxing* was instituted, and in the twenty-eighth that for full-aged horses. Are not all these marks of reality? and is there any instance of an imposture being clogged with so many unessential circumstances?

Upon the whole, it is no extravagance to say, that the list of the Olympic Victors has an authority equal, if not superior, to that of any documents whatever, of the same kind. It consisted of entries made by a public officer, relative to transactions of

L the

the greatest notoriety, which the parties themselves, their relations, and their country, were highly interested to keep in memory. Greater security than this for the integrity of any record it is impossible to have ; and therefore to doubt the truth of it would be to introduce universal scepticism.

Having now shewn upon what authority the Olympic Register stands, I come next to consider the objections raised against it by Sir ISAAC NEWTON ; which will be found, I apprehend, to be by no means sufficient to overturn the evidence in favour
of

of its general veracity. His first and principal objection is taken from two lists of Spartan kings; that kingdom by a very particular constitution having been governed by two contemporary kings, the lineal representatives of two brothers, EURYSTHENES and PROCLES, who conquered it. The beginning of the Messenian war, as calculated by the Greeks, is fixed by PAUSANIAS* to the second year of the ninth Olympiad, at which time ALCAMENES of the house of EURYSTHENES was king of Sparta, and THEOPOMPUS of the house of PRO-

* Messen. p. 292.

148 ON THE CHRONOLOGY
CLES *. From this year, according to the Olympic computation, it was 263 years to the expedition of XERXES, which happened in the first year of the 75th Olympiad. In this long interval of 263 years, we find only eight kings of the house of EURYSTHENES, exclusive of ALCAMENES, and only seven, strictly speaking, of the house of PROCLES, exclusive of THEOPOMPUS. The list of the *Eurysthenidæ* is as follows:
1. POLYDORUS. 2. EURYCRATES.
3. ANAXANDER. 4. EURYCRATES the Second. 5. LEON.
6. ANAXANDRIDES. 7. CLEOMENES. 8. LEONIDAS. This is

* Meffen. p. 288.

the

the list of Kings as given by PAUSANIAS*. That given by HERODOTUS† leaves out CLEOMENES, because it is not a list of Kings, but only of the Progenitors of LEONIDAS, the brother of CLEOMENES. The kings of the *Proclidæ* family, according to PAUSANIAS‡, were,

1. ZEUXIDAMUS, who succeeded his grandfather THEOPOMPUS.
2. ANAXIDAMUS. 3. ARCHIDAMUS. 4. AGASICLES. 5. ARISTO.
6. DEMARATUS, who was deposed, and succeeded by, 7. LEOTYCHIDES. The list given by

* Lacon. p. 209—214.

† L. VII. c. 204.

‡ Lacon. p. 220, 1.

HERODOTUS*, differs considerably from this. According to him their names were, 1. ANAXANDRIDAS. 2. ARCHIDAMUS. 3. ANAXILAUS. 4. LEOTYCHIDES the First. 5. HIPPOCRATIDES, whose son HEGESILAUS, and grandson MENARES, not succeeding to the crown, the next king in succession is, 6. LEOTYCHIDES, the son of MENARES. It is not very material to settle the difference between HERODOTUS, the older writer, and PAUSANIAS the more diligent antiquary, because though Herodotus lessens the number of kings, he adds one to the number of generations. Now what

* Lacon. VIII. c. 131.

is the observation of Sir ISAAC upon these two lists? He tells us*, that “by the ordinary course
 “of nature kings reign one with
 “another about 18 or 20 years
 “a-piece;” and having laid down this rule, he applies it, among others, to the Spartan kings abovementioned; according to which the interval between the first and the last of those kings amounts to no more than 140 years; whereas, if we reckon by the Olympiads, it makes, as I said, 263.

To all such reasoning I have one general answer; that the

* Chronol. p. 54.

reigns of kings not depending upon the common chance of mortality, or upon any simple and constant natural causes, but upon a variety of natural and political causes, operating in conjunction; such as their own folly or wisdom, the caprice of the multitude, the treachery of their own subjects, and the invasion of foreign powers: all these causes, I say, render the length of reigns so uncertain and variable, that though we may form an average of them as we may of any thing else, we cannot reason firmly and solidly upon that average. We cannot rationally say; so many kings of Persia,

Persia, Macedonia, France, or England, reigned, one with another, about 20 years each, and therefore so many emperors of Japan did not reign longer. If we take the three last kings of France, their reigns amount in the whole to 164 years, which is at the rate of 55 years for each. But the reigns of GALBA, OTHO, and VITELLIUS, three succeeding emperors of Rome, did not amount in all to a year and three quarters. What dependence can there be upon a calculation of things that differ so enormously? For either we know the history of the reigns which are the subject of calculation, or we do not.

If

If we do not, how can we be sure that they did not succeed one another as rapidly as the emperors of Rome just mentioned? or, on the contrary, that the crown did not devolve successively to minors, who enjoyed it peaceably to a good old age, which was nearly the case of the three French kings? If we *do* know the history, then this method of calculation is superseded by positive and substantial evidence. So that in no case is it useful as a medium of proof; and should therefore be rejected, as totally unworthy of attention.

Generations of men, though sufficiently vague, are however a
better

better ground for calculation than the reigns of kings; the one having no other limits than the period of life; whereas the generative faculty does not exist in full force above a third part of that period. Now, in the present case, the learned and diligent PAUSANIAS, who has probably given us the true list of both the races of these Spartan kings *, (for one of those in HERODOTUS is palpably erroneous), this same PAUSANIAS has also given us a very circumstantial account of their genealogy. Is it not therefore a little extraordinary that Sir ISAAC NEWTON,

* Lacon. p. 209 & 220.

having

having it in his option to calculate this interval of time by the more accurate method, should chuse to do it by the more vague and inaccurate? We shall presently see, that had he calculated by generations, his objection against the authenticity of the Olympiads would not have been near so strong: and one cannot therefore help suspecting, that, great and candid as he unquestionably was, he was, in this instance, drawn out of the right path by a bias, imperceptible to himself, in favour of his own opinions.

Sir ISAAC NEWTON has stated
very fairly his method of computation

tation by reigns, and the difference between them and generations. He says*, that “generations from father to son may
 “ be reckoned, one with another,
 “ at about 33 or 34 years a-piece,
 “ or about three generations to a
 “ hundred years; but if the
 “ reckoning proceed by the eldest
 “ sons, they are shorter, so
 “ that three of them may be
 “ reckoned at about 75 or 80
 “ years. And the reigns of kings
 “ are still shorter: because kings
 “ are succeeded not only by their
 “ eldest sons, but sometimes by
 “ their brothers; and sometimes
 “ they are slain or deposed, and

* Chonol. p. 53. 54.

“ suc-

“succeeded by others of an
“equal or greater age, especially
“in elective or turbulent king-
“doms.” All this is undoubtedly true ; and being so, one does not see with what propriety an average, drawn from this method of computation by reigns, can be applied to cases, where we know, from good authority, that there was no revolution, or change of family, but that the crown descended peaceably from father to son. Suppose a calculator was to establish this rule, that the duration of a ship, including accidents from fire and shipwreck, was, upon a medium, 15 years; would this
be

be conclusive with respect to the duration of any number of ships, which we might know from good authority to have met with no such accident? In like manner, where the crown descends regularly from father to son, we have nothing to do with a rule, which pre-supposes an interrupted succession. Our business here is to calculate by generations, where the error, we may confidently say, cannot be great; whereas in calculating unknown time by reigns, there is no possibility of guessing what it may be. If we had no history of the Roman emperors from CÆSAR to CONSTANTINE, and
were

were reduced to the necessity of calculating by Sir ISAAC's average, how extravagantly would it mislead us? For the number of reigns being 44, reckoning the emperors who reigned together only as one, this multiplied by 18, which is Sir ISAAC's lowest average, would give 792 for the number of years, whereas in fact they were only 373.

Let us now see, how the calculation by generations will suit with the above-mentioned period of 263 years. According to PAUSANIAS *, the generations of the *Eurysthenidæ*, from the fe-

* Lacon. p. 210. 214.

cond year of the ninth Olympiad, were seven in number, exclusive of ALCAMENES, who is the head of the list; 1. POLYDORUS. 2. EURYCRATES. 3. ANAXANDER. 4. EURYCRATES the Second. 5. LEON. 6. ANAXANDRIDES. 7. LEONIDAS. Those of the *Proclidæ*, excluding in like manner THEOPOMPUS, were, according to the same author*, 1. ARCHIDAMUS, who dying before his father, never reigned. 2. ZEUXIDAMUS. 3. ANAXIDAMUS. 4. ARCHIDAMUS. 5. AGASICLES. 6. ARISTO. 7. DEMARATUS, who, though deposed, was still living, and accom-

* Lacon. p. 220, 1.

panied XERXES on his expedition. Divide 263 years by 7, and the quotient is 37, with a remainder of 4, which makes 37 years and a half for each generation. This, though rather more than is commonly allowed, is greatly within the limits of possibility; and therefore the excess, even if there were no way of accounting for it, would not furnish any conclusive argument against the authenticity of a public record.

But I must observe, that the cause of this irregularity, is to be found in the history itself. ANAXANDRIDES, the sixth in our list of the EURYSTHENIDÆ, was
so

so long without children by his first wife, that, according to PAUSANIAS * and HERODOTUS †, he was compelled by the *Ephori* to take another, for fear the race of EURYSTHENES should be extinct. This second wife brought him CLEOMENES, his immediate successor; after which he had three sons, DORIEUS, and LEONIDAS, and CLEOMBROTUS, by his first. LEONIDAS therefore was born when his father was advanced towards the latter part of the generative period. It was also late in life before LEONIDAS succeeded to the throne; for his

* Lacon. p. 211.

† L. v. c. 39, 40.

half-brother CLEOMENES, who was advanced to it before him, did not become King till his brother DORIEUS was of an age to command a fleet and army, and to settle a colony. CLEOMENES reigned upwards of twenty years ; so that LEONIDAS, at the time of his accession, was probably near forty ; and this being twelve years before the expedition of XERXES, LEONIDAS at the time of that event may be considered as a man of about two and fifty.

A similar accident happened about the same time in the family of the *Proclidæ*. ARISTO,
the

OF THE OLYMPIADS. 165
the sixth in our list, had, according to HERODOTUS *, married two wives ; but, still continuing childless, was desirous of marrying a third ; and cast his eyes upon the wife of his friend AGETUS, who, having been betrayed into an oath not to withhold any thing in his possession from the king, surrendered her to him with reluctance. By this third wife he had DEMARATUS, who at the time of the invasion of Attica by the Spartans, in support of the faction of ISAGORAS †, was old enough to be joined in command

* L. VI. c. 62, 63.

† Herod. V. c. 74, 5.

with CLEOMENES, and therefore was probably not less than fifty years of age, when XERXES, near thirty years after, invaded Greece.

We have here two kings of Sparta, neither of them born in the first youth of his father, and both of them declining in life at the celebrated epocha of the battle of Thermopylæ. Taking these circumstances together, we may fairly, I think, add an eighth, or nearly an eighth, generation to the seven, for which we have an incontestable warrant from history. And this being done, if we divide 263, which is the Olympic number of years,
by

by 8, the quotient will be a little less than 33, and it will be half a year short of Sir ISAAC's own allowance for a generation, which is between 33. and 34 years. Neither is this allowance greatly too much for the duration of the reigns of Kings, where the succession follows the eldest son; for if we examine the genealogies from WILLIAM the Conqueror to his present majesty, we shall find them to be three and twenty in number, excluding, as we ought, either the first of these Kings or the last; and then, if we divide 713, which is the number of years between 1066, the year of the Conquest, and

the year 1779, by 23, we shall find the quotient to be exactly 31. And though the line of genealogy goes in two instances through a younger son, that is, through HENRY the First, and JOHN of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, which of course adds something to the length of those generations: yet in two others it passes through a sister elder than the male heir, that is, through MARGARET daughter of HENRY VII, and the queen of Bohemia, daughter of James I. so that what is gained by one aberration is lost by the other.

If it be thought probable, that kings in particular should marry
and

and have heirs before the age of 33 : I answer in the first place, that both HESIOD and SOLON, almost the only writers from whom we can learn the customs of that age, both these, I say, have fixed upon thirty, as the seasonable age for marrying. The words of HESIOD have been often quoted * :

Μήτε τριηκόντων ἑτέων μάλα πολλ'
ἀπολείπων,

Μήτ' ἐπιθεὶς μάλα πολλά.

Those of SOLON are still more apposite. Having divided human life into stages of seven years each ; he speaks thus of the fifth † :

* *Erg.* v. 696.

† *Ap. Clem. Alexand. Strom. L. vi. p. 686.*

Πέμπτῃ δ' ὥριον ἄνδρα γάμῳ μεμ-
νημένον εἶναι.

But secondly; though kings should be supposed to marry earlier, some allowance should be made for their wives not being pregnant immediately; or for the first children being daughters; or, if males, for their dying as a great proportion of infants does before they are past their childhood.

So much for the argument drawn from the usual time that kings, upon an average, may be supposed to reign. I come now to consider a few scattered pas-

OF THE OLYMPIADS. 171
passages of the ancient Greek
writers, which have been thought
to contradict and overthrow the
Olympic Chronology.

And first, we are told by
PLATO*, that the laws of LY-
CURGUS had been then established
a little more than three hundred
years; ἔτη τριακόσια ἢ ὀλίγω πλείω.
Here if the reading be right, and
the author well informed, the
argument is conclusive. But as
the change of a letter or two
frequently makes a great change
in the sense, the first question to
be considered is the correctness
of the text, and whether it can

* In Minoe, p. 567. Ed. F.

be so far depended upon, as to overfet the concurrent testimony of all antiquity. It would be no great alteration to read ἔτη τετρακόσια instead of τριακόσια, and such a mistake might be accounted for several ways; either from the first syllable of τετρακόσια being obliterated, or else those two letters τ, ε, might be dropt, from their similarity to the last syllable of ἔτη; after which the substitution of τριακόσια for τετρακόσια might very easily happen. Admitting τετρακόσια to be the true reading, it will sufficiently quadrate with the Olympic Chronology. SOCRATES is supposed to have been born in
the

the third year of Olym. LXXVII. that is 307 years after the first Olympiad. Add to this 50 years for the age of SOCRATES, at the time when this conversation happened. This makes the number 357. Concerning the time when LYCURGUS flourished there were several opinions; some making him coæval with the first Olympiad; others, according to PLUTARCH*, setting him many years before it; and others, I presume, at other intervening periods. Now as we are quite in the dark which of these opinions PLATO followed, we are at full liberty to chuse that, to

* Vit. Lycurg. init.

which

174 ON THE CHRONOLOGY

which the expression of ἔτη τετρακόσια ἢ ὀλίγη πλείω will most perfectly agree.

Secondly, THUCYDIDES, according to Sir ISAAC NEWTON *, affirms, that “ from the time
“ the Lacedæmonians had used
“ one and the same administra-
“ tion of their commonwealth
“ to the end of the Peloponne-
“ sian war, there were *three hun-*
“ *dred years* and a few more.” This difficulty, supposing the quotation exact, would be of less consequence than the preceding ; for it might be got over without any alteration of the

* Chronol. p. 57.

text.

text. By the words *one and the same administration of the commonwealth* the Historian might mean, not the laws of LYCURGUS, but the new form, which the government assumed in the reign of THEOPOMPUS, by the institution of the *Ephori*; an event which we may suppose to have happened in the last year of Olymp. XI. exactly in the middle of his reign. From this year to the taking of Athens by LY-SANDER, there is an interval of 82 Olympiads and one year, that is, of 329 years; to which space the expression of THUCYDIDES might naturally and without violence be applied. But in fact THUCYDIDES does not say what Sir ISAAC

im-

146 ON THE CHRONOLOGY
imputes to him. The word in
all the known copies of the ori-
ginal text * is τετραχόσια, *four*
hundred, for which *three hun-*
dred has been substituted in the
old Latin translation, where
only it is to be found. This
larger number, it is obvious,
must be applied to the laws of
LYCURGUS, and there can be
no difficulty in applying it, as
THUCYDIDES has no where told
us, what interval he placed be-
tween LYCURGUS and the first
Olympiad.

I shall not at present examine
the objection which Sir ISAAC
makes † to the Græcian Chro-

* L. I. c. 18. Ed. Duker.

† Chronol. p. 55.

nology,

nology, from the *Lacedæmonian* (not *Messenian* *) army having been commanded in the second year of Olymp. X. by one EURYLEON, the sixth in descent from THERAS, who lived during the invasion of the *Heracidae*, because this objection principally affects the time preceding the Olympiads; whereas the present matter of discussion is the genuineness of the Olympiads themselves. I proceed therefore to an objection of much more importance, which affects the Olympiads only; and, if substantially supported, would go a great way towards overthrowing

* Pausan. Messen. p. 296.

N their

their credit. HERODOTUS, in his list of the noble youths, who solicited the daughter of CLISTHENES in marriage, mentions one LEOCEDES, the son of PHIDON. His words are *, ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννήσου Φείδωνος τῷ Ἀργείων τυράννῃ πατρὶς Λεωνήδης, Φείδωνος δὲ τῷ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελοποννησίοισι, καὶ ὑβρίσαντος μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων ὅς ἐξαναστήσας τὰς Ἡλείων ἀγῶνοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε. The words, as they stand, can mean nothing but that LEOCEDES was the son of PHIDON, the tyrant of Argos, and the same PHIDON, who established the Peloponnesian weights and mea-

* Lib. VI. c. 127.

fures ; who was guilty of greater excesses than any other of the Greeks, and having ejected the *Agonothetæ* of the Eleans presided himself at the Olympic Games. The time of the PHIDON, who usurped this office, is fixed by PAUSANIAS to the eighth Olympiad *; and with him STRABO † in effect agrees, by making PHIDON the tenth in descent from TEMENUS. The Arundel Marble indeed speaks of one PHIDON an ARGIVE, who coined money 415 years before the expedition of XERXES ‡; that is 119 years before the first Olympiad. But

* Eliac. II. p. 509.

† Lib. VIII. p. 549.

‡ Marm. Oxon. I. 1. 45.

as nothing is said of his tyranny or invasion of his neighbours, it is possible that in the Marble, as well as in Herodotus, he may have been confounded with PHIDON of Corinth, a very ancient Lawgiver mentioned by ARISTOTLE *. Or even if the same PHIDON be meant, the mistake is not greater than some others which have been found in that famous Chronology. Be this as it may, my argument is not at all benefited by following the computation of PAUSANIAS and STRABO, rather than that of the Marble ; because in either case, if it should clearly appear, that

* Politic. II. p. 35. Ed. Sylburg.

LEOCEDES, the son of this PHIDON, courted the daughter of CLISTHENES, it will equally prove the incorrectness of the Olympic list, or rather indeed the non-existence of a great part of the Olympiads. Sir ISAAC very justly places CLISTHENES in the 47th Olympiad, and his daughter being courted by the son of PHIDON, it follows that he and PHIDON were nearly equal in age. Now PHIDON is said to have lived in the eighth Olympiad, and CLISTHENES 154 years later, in the 47th. The consequence evidently is, if they were really contemporaries, that the Olympiads must have been ex-

182 ON THE CHRONOLOGY
tended near 140 years beyond
the truth.

The attentive reader will observe, that the whole of this argument rests upon one single passage in HERODOTUS, and consequently falls to the ground, if that passage should happen to have been incorrectly transcribed; if it has been interpolated or mutilated, so as to alter the sense. Now the perfect correctness of any one passage, considering the many corruptions to which books are liable, is a thing too uncertain to be relied upon, in opposition to the weight of evidence in favour of the Olympic Chronology.

nology. In this very passage, two of the manuscripts omit the important word *παῖς*, which leaves room for supposing that *LEOCEDES* might be only the descendent of *PHIDON*. But for my own part I am inclined to believe, that the word *παῖς* is genuine, and no interpolation; though I think that the passage is evidently corrupted. The adverbative particle *δὲ* comes in very awkwardly and improperly in the second part of the sentence, supposing the writer to speak of the same *PHIDON* in both places; and if we strike it out, the repetition of the word *Φείδωνος* has a poetical air, very unsuitable to history.

I would read therefore Φείδωνος
 τῷ Ἀργείων τυράννι παῖς Λεωκῆδης,
 Φείδωνος δὲ ΟΥ τῷ τὰ μέτρα ποιή-
 σαντος, &c. &c. In English: “LEO-
 “ CEDES the son of PHIDON, king
 “ of Argos ; but *not* of that PHI-
 “ DON who established the Pello-
 “ ponnesian measures,” and so
 forth. This correction supposes
 that PHIDON, the father of LEO-
 CEDES, though several genera-
 tions later than the enterprizing
 PHIDON, still possessed the so-
 vereignty of Argos : the proba-
 bility of which it may be neces-
 sary to establish, it not being
 generally known, that Argos
 continued to be a monarchical
 state so long. What Sir ISAAC

NEWTON

NEWTON asserts *, that “between CISUS (the son of TEMENUS) and PHIDON they reigned not,” is a mistake, arising from his understanding the words of PAUSANIAS in too strong a sense. That learned antiquary says †, that the Argives, being from the most ancient times lovers of equality and independence, reduced the power of the kings so low—
 ὥς μηδένι τῶν Κείσε ἢ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις
 ἢ τὸ ὄνομα λειφθῆναι τῆς βασιλείας
 μόνον—“that nothing but the name of royalty was left to the descendants of CISUS.” The passage in the Greek is intricate and

* Chronol. p. 123.

† Corinth. p. 152.

corrupt; nor will it be much mended by reading ὥς ΜΗΔΕΝ μηδένι τῶν κείσθ — which would signify, “*so that nothing was left to any of the descendents of CISUS and to his descendents, but the name only of royalty.*” PAUSANIAS, in the following sentence, mentions one MEDON, from whom the last king of Argos was descended; and SATYRUS, an ancient historian, quoted by THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch*, speaks of MARON as the son and immediate successor of CISUS. I would read therefore — ὥς μήδεν ΜΗΔΩΝΙ τῷ Κείσθ, ἢ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις, ἢ τὸ ὄνομα λειφθῆναι τῆς βασιλείας

* Ad Autolyicum. l. II. p. 96. Ed. Wolf.

μόνον—“*so that nothing was left to MEDON, the son of CISUS, and his descendents, but the name only of royalty.*” It is plain from this passage alone, that the lineal descendents of CISUS, the son of TEMENUS, continued to be kings of Argos for some time; and ARISTOTLE, in his *Politicks* *, expressly says, that PHIDON the Argive of a King became a Tyrant; so that the kingdom was his by inheritance. But neither was PHIDON the last to whom it went in succession. For PAUSANIAS, in the sentence immediately following, says, “that the people [of Argos] being dis-

* L. V. p. 152. Ed. Sylburg. .

affected

affected to MELTAS, the son of LACIDES, and descendent of MEDON, deprived him of the government entirely. The kingdom of Argos therefore was possessed, as an hereditary, though limited, monarchy, by the son of LACIDES; a word, which, when corrected to LACEDES, as LEOCIDES in HERODOTUS has been to LEOCEDES, turns out to be the same name, differing no otherwise than as Μενελεως does from Μενελας, or LEODAMAS from LAODAMAS. DEMOCEDES, a name repeatedly mentioned in HERODOTUS, is a word of the same import. Upon the whole then it seems highly probable, that
the

OF THE OLYMPIADS. 139
the LEOCIDES, or LEOCEDES, of
HERODOTUS, was son to the king
of Argos, whatever the name of
his father was. I suppose it to
have been PHIDON, who being
an obscure person, compared with
his ancestor the invader of Elis,
it became necessary for HERODO-
TUS to caution his readers against
confounding one with the other.
If the conjecture here proposed,
to which I foresee no material
objection, be admitted, it entirely
removes the Chronological diffi-
culty insisted upon by Sir ISAAC
NEWTON.

A fourth objection to the
Olympic Chronology is taken
7 from

190 ON THE CHRONOLOGY
from a passage in PAUSANIAS *,
where he is supposed to say, “that
CYPSELUS, king of Corinth, was
the sixth in descent from MELAS,
the contemporary of ALETES,
who got possession of Corinth
when the *Heraclidæ* returned
into Peloponnesus †. The reign
of CYPSELUS began in the 30th
or 31st Olympiad; and by this
reckoning MELAS must have lived
only two generations before the
first Olympiad; whereas his con-
temporary ALETES was also con-
temporary with TEMENUS ‡, seven
or eight generations older than
that Period. Admitting there-

* Eliac. I. p. 424.

† Chronol. p. 62.

‡ Strabo, L. VIII. p. 597.

fore CYPSELUS to have been only the sixth from MELAS, we must annihilate about five generations, which are nearly equal to one and forty Olympiads, of the interval between them. But the same PAUSANIAS, from whom this is quoted, tells us in another place*, that ALETES and his descendents reigned at Corinth for five generations, the last being BACCHIS, the son of PRUMNIS : that after him the so-called *Bacchiadæ* reigned there for five other generations, ending with TELESTES, the son of ARISTODEMUS, who was killed by ARIEUS and PERANTAS : after which

* Corinthiac. p. 120.

Corinth was not governed by kings, but by annual magistrates of the race of the *Bacchiadæ*, till the time of their expulsion by CYPSELUS." This account of PAUSANIAS is clear and circumstantial; and from it we learn, that there were at least ten generations between the time of MELAS and CYPSELUS; and how many more we are not informed. The word ἐκτον therefore, in the passage of PAUSANIAS, quoted by Sir ISAAC, is indisputably a corruption. It might be altered to ἐνδεκατον; but a careful examination of the context has convinced me, that the original word was not a word
of

of number. The passage stands thus in the editions * : Κυψέλω ἢ τοῖς προγόνοις ἔκτον ἦν γένος ἐξαρχῆς Γονέσης τῆς Σικυῶνος, ἢ πρόγονος σφίσιν ἦν Μέλας ὁ Αντάσσης. If this passage admits of any sense at all, it must be something like the following: CYPSELUS *and his ancestors were in the sixth generation from GONUSSA of Sicyon, and their Progenitor was MELAS the son of ANTASSUS.* But this, as the reader must see, is full of absurdities. GONUSSA is the name of a *place* in the country of Sicyon; and not, as Sir ISAAC imagined, of a *person*. It is moreover a palpable blunder to say,

* Pausan. Eliac. I. p. 424.

O

that

that CYPSELUS, and his ancestors, were in the sixth generation from any body ; for if he was in the sixth, his father must have been in the fifth ; and his grandfather in the fourth. It appears probable to me, that EKTON was formerly EK GON, and that Γονασης does not occupy its proper place, but should follow the præposition ἐκ, the whole standing thus : Κυψέλω ἢ τοῖς προγόνοις ΕΚ ΓΟΝΟΥΣΣΗΣ ἦν γένος ἐξαρχῆς τῆς Σικυώνος, ἢ πρόγονος σφίσιν ἦν Μέλας ὁ Αντάσσε.

“ *The race of CYPSELUS and his*
 “ *ancestors was originally from*
 “ *Gonussa in the country of Si-*
 “ *cyon, and their progenitor was*
 “ *MELAS,*

“MELAS, *the son of* ANTASSUS.”

This agrees exactly with what he says in another place *, that “MELAS, the son of ANTASSUS, came from GONUSSA beyond Sicyon, to serve in the Dorian army against Corinth, and that ALETES with difficulty was prevailed upon to receive him.” The alteration which I have proposed may seem bold; but, I hope, it is not extravagantly so. They who are acquainted with MSS know, how common it is for a word, or part of a word, to be obliterated at the beginning or end of a line. Supposing this to have happened to the latter part of the word

* Corinthiac. p. 120.

Γονυσσης, the text would stand *εκ Γον*. Then comes a corrector, and puts the word Γονυσσης in the margin, which the next transcriber inserts in an improper place, changing EK ΓON at the same time into EKTON.

I cannot dismiss this argument without observing, that Sir ISAAC, who would here make ALETES only *six* generations older than CYPSELUS, and has urged this as a fact that overturns the common Chronology; yet himself, in another place *, reckons up by name the successors and lineal descendants of ALETES to the num-

* Chronol. p. 142.

ber of *eight*, and adds to them 42 annual Archons, all intervening between ALETES and CYPSELUS. So little are the best and wisest of men upon their guard, when they have a favourite opinion to support.

I now proceed in the fifth place to consider the difficulty suggested by the age of TERPANDER, the famous musician. "*Athenæus*," to use the words of Sir ISAAC *, "tells us out of ancient authors (*Hellanicus, Sosimus, Hieronymus*) that *Lycurgus* the Legislator was contemporary to *Terpander* the mu-

* Chronol. p. 58.

“ fician, and that *Terpander* was
 “ the first man who got the vic-
 “ tory in the *Carnea*, in a so-
 “ lemnity of music instituted in
 “ those festivals in the 26th
 “ Olympiad.” The inference is
 plain, that if *LYCURGUS* lived till
 the 26th Olympiad, the preced-
 ing Olympiads must be fictitious.
 But here I must take the liberty
 to say, that the words of Sir
ISAAC convey a false idea, much
 too favourable to his system. The
 natural meaning of them is, that
 there are three ancient historians,
 who expressly give testimony
 against the common notion of
LYCURGUS having lived a hun-
 dred years prior to the first Olym-
 piad ;

piad; and instead of that bring him a hundred years below it. But the fact is, that not one of these ancient authors says either that, or any thing like it. The words of Athenæus literally translated, run thus *. “ That TER-
 “ PANDER was older than ANA-
 “ CREON is plain from the fol-
 “ lowing testimonies. TERPAN-
 “ DER was the first who obtained
 “ the prize in the *Carnea*, as
 “ HELLANICUS relates, both in
 “ his metrical and prose account
 “ of the *Carneonicæ*. Now the
 “ institution of the *Carnea* was
 “ in the 26th Olympiad, as So-
 “ simus affirms in his Chronolo-

* L. XIV. p. 635.

“ gy. But HIERONYMUS, in his
 “ book upon *Citharoedi*, which
 “ is the fifth of his work upon
 “ *Poets*, says, that TERPANDER
 “ lived in the time of LYCURGUS
 “ the Lawgiver, whom all wri-
 “ ters unanimously allow to have
 “ assisted IPHITUS the Elean in
 “ that institution of the Olympic
 “ games, which is reckoned the
 “ first.” We see here three dif-
 ferent writers, attesting three se-
 parate unconnected facts, plainly
 considered by ATHENÆUS as
 contradictory one to another, but
 which must be all brought to-
 gether, and all supposed to be
 true, before Sir ISAAC’s conclu-
 sion can be made out from them.

This

This surely is very different from having each of the three witnesses speak to all the three facts. Even HIERONYMUS, the only one of them who brings LYCURGUS and TERPANDER together, agreed with all other writers, I suppose, (since all writers, according to ATHENÆUS, were agreed) that LYCURGUS lived at the time of the first institution of the Olympiads by IPHITUS, and therefore, had Hieronymus known the assertions of the other two, he would certainly have rejected one or other of them. So that here we have a point made out, it seems, not by three unanimous witnesses in the common way; but by three
who

who contradict and refute one another.

What ground Hieronymus might have for his singular notion, that LYCURGUS and TERPANDER were contemporaries, it is impossible (ATHENÆUS having said nothing) to conjecture. But singular it certainly was; for PLUTARCH, in the Book *de Musica* *, where he enquires very minutely into the age of TERPANDER, does not give the least hint of any such opinion having been started. He appears to have placed him nearly where the Arundel Marble places him, a

* Moral. p. 1132.

little before ARCHILOCHUS; though the story which he tells, of his carrying away the prize four times successively at the Pythian Games is not consistent with that marble; unless we suppose him to mean Pythian Games, celebrated at irregular intervals, in some period prior to their final establishment*.

The same LYCUREUS furnishes Sir ISAAC with a sixth objection to the Olympic Chronology †, which it is much easier to answer, than to preserve in answering the temper and decorum due

* Compare also Clem. Alex. Lib. I. p. 333. Ed. Par.

† Chronol. p. 58.

to so high a character. It seems there was a Disc at Olympia, which had the name of LYCURGUS inscribed upon it. Hence ARISTOTLE, according to PLUTARCH *, inferred, that LYCURGUS was contemporary with Iphitus, the founder of the Olympic Games, and assisted in the establishment of them. Sir ISAAC taking it for granted that this Disc was one of those used by the Athletes, finding that the Disc was a part of the *Pentathlos*, and having learnt from PAUSANIAS †, that from the time the Olympiads were celebrated in a regular series, the *Pentathlos* was

* V. Lycurg, p. 85. Ed. Bryan.

† Eliac. I. p. 394.

never

never practised till the 18th of those Olympiads, he concludes, that it was at this very time LYCURGUS was present, and consequently that his age has been set near 140 years too high by the Chronologers. The conclusion is much too hasty, even though the premises had been true. I need not inform the reader, that the invention and custom of casting the Disc, as a trial of skill, was older than LYCURGUS, being mentioned by HOMER. And though HOMER himself, partaking of the common fate of his countrymen, loses somewhat of his antiquity in the hands of Sir ISAAC, he is still admitted to have
I been

been prior to LYCURGUS. Now the game of the Disc being confessedly older than the *Pentatblos*; what absurdity is there in supposing that it might be separately practised at the Olympic Festival, as PINDAR expressly affirms it was in some places *, before it was combined with other exercises to make the *Pentatblos*? It is only in organized productions, whether animal or vegetable, that a part cannot exist before the whole, but in civil institutions nothing is more common. And when it is supposed, that the Game of the Disc could not exist before the *Quinquertium*, it might

* Isthm. F.

with

with equal justice be said, that the union of any two unconnected offices in the same person is a proof, that neither of them at any former period had been separately exercised.

This would be a sufficient answer. But the reader will be surprized to hear, that the fact is, not what Sir ISAAC has stated it to be, but exactly the reverse. PAUSANIAS does not say, that the *Pentatblos*, or combination of the Disc, with four other Games, was first practised, or instituted in the 18th Olympiad. His account is to this effect *. “ After

* Eliac. I. p. 394.

“ IPHITUS

“ IPHITUS had revived the festi-
 “ val in the manner above re-
 “ lated, the memory of many
 “ antient customs was still lost,
 “ and it was by slow degrees that
 “ men came to the remembrance
 “ of them, and added to the
 “ Games whatever they happened
 “ to recollect. This is manifest.
 “ For reckoning from the time
 “ when the memorials of the
 “ Olympiads go on without in-
 “ terruption, the first prize given
 “ was for the foot-race, which
 “ was won by COROEBUS the Ele-
 “ an. Afterwards in the four-
 “ teenth Olympiad the *Diaulos*
 “ was added, and HYPENUS of
 “ Pisa carried away the olive-
 “ branch

“ branch for the *Diaulos*, as
 “ ACANTHUS did in the next
 “ Olympiad. Then in the 18th
 “ Olympiad they recollected the
 “ *Pentathlos* and the wrestling.”

The *Pentathlos* therefore was no new invention of that time, but the very words of PAUSANIAS shew, that it had been practised long before the revival of the Olympic games by IPHITUS, so long indeed as to have gone into disuse and oblivion. And hence it follows, not only that the Disc and *Pentathlos* might be as old as the time at which LYCURGUS is commonly placed; but, if Sir ISAAC's inference be just, that the Disc was given by LY-

P CURGUS,

CURGUS, at the first institution of the *Pentathlos*, it will lead also to another very unexpected conclusion, that LYCURGUS himself must have lived a generation or two before the first Olympiad.

But what if the Disc of LYCURGUS, after all, should have no relation to the *Pentathlos*, or to the Disc thrown by the Athletes? PAUSANIAS informs us *, that there was preserved at Elis a Disc of IPHITUS, on which was inscribed the armistice proclaimed by the Eleans, the inscription being not in a strait line, but running circularly round the

* Eliac. I. p. 427.

Disc. Mr. JOHN JACKSON, in his Chronology, conjectures with great probability, that this was the Disc alluded to by PLUTARCH *; and his opinion seems to be confirmed by the inference that ARISTOTLE drew from it, which was, not that LYCURGUS was the companion of IPHITUS in restoring the Olympic Games, as Sir ISAAC surmises, but that he assisted in settling the armistice.

The last argument of Sir ISAAC against the Olympic Chronology is taken from the list of the Macedonian kings: and this indeed his manner of stating it has ren-

* See before, p. 204.

dered rather strong. The interval of time which these kings are to fill up terminates in two epochs, one undisputed and certain, the expedition of XERXES; the other much less determinate, the reign of PHIDON*, the king of Argos and invader of Elis. This invasion, according to PAUSANIAS, who speaks without any marks of doubt, or hesitation, happened in the eighth Olympiad †; but the Arundel marble, if understood of the same PHIDON, carries him a full hundred years higher. The latter computation was evidently the most to Sir ISAAC NEWTON's purpose,

* See before, p. 179.

† Eliac. II. p. 509.

and

and therefore when he reasons fluently from this, without taking any notice of the other, he certainly does full justice to his argument. In a matter of such high antiquity, where most of the authors, who might have assisted us, are lost, I should think that I had as good a right to follow the authority of PAUSANIAS, even if it were single and unsupported, as Sir ISAAC has to follow the marble. But this is not the case. For STRABO, who was certainly well acquainted with the old Greek Historians, makes PHIDON the tenth from TEMENUS *, which exactly falls

* Lib. VIII. p. 549.

214 ON THE CHRONOLOGY
in with the reckoning of PAU-
SANIAS. PHIDON therefore being
supposed to reign in the eighth
Olympiad, the interval between
the end of that Olympiad and the
beginning of the 75th is exactly
264 years.

The number of Macedonian
princes who are to fill up that
interval, is a still more disputa-
ble point. HERODOTUS* makes
ALEXANDER, the contemporary of
XERXES, the seventh king from
the beginning of the monarchy ;
and with this computation THU-
CYDIDES in effect agrees †. In
the list given by HERODOTUS,

* Lib. VIII. c. 139.

† Lib. II. c. 100.

PERDICCAS stands first : which, I apprehend, is no further true than that PERDICCAS was the first who reigned under the title of King : which is precisely what SOLINUS asserts *. But if we may believe other ancient authors, PERDICCAS was by no means the person, or contemporary with the person, who under the reign of PHIDON quitted Argos, and removed into Macedonia. This person, by every author but HERODOTUS, is called CARANUS, whom we learn from SYNCELLUS to have been the brother of PHIDON †. He is mentioned also by PLUTARCH ‡,

* Cap. IX.

† Syncell. Chron. p. 158. Ed. Venet.

‡ Vit. Alexand. p. 6.

216 ON THE CHRONOLOGY

PAUSANIAS *, and DIODORUS SICULUS †; by SATYRUS, an ancient author quoted by THEOPHILUS bishop of Antioch ‡; and among the Latins by LIVY §, PATERCULUS ||, JUSTIN **, and SOLINUS ††. Then follows another question, whether any generations intervened between CARANUS and PERDICCAS. The list of the Macedonian Kings in SYNCCELLUS ‡‡ inserts two, by the names of COENUS and TYRIMMAS ; and he also informs us,

* Boeot. p. 794.

† Ap. Syncell, p. 209.

‡ Ad Autolyc. II. p. 96. Ed. Wolf.

§ Dec. V. Lib. V.

|| Lib. I.

** Lib. VII.

†† Cap. IX.

‡‡ Chron. p. 209. Ed. Venet.

that

that COENUS was the son of CARANUS, and TYRIMMAS of COENUS. In other respects his list agrees exactly with that of HERODOTUS, which I hope will be no diminution of its authority. The above quoted SATYRUS also inserts the same two names between CARANUS and PERDICCAS; though he differs from HERODOTUS and SYNCELLUS, by leaving out ARGÆUS, the son of PERDICCAS; whose existence however is established both by the authority of JUSTIN *, and by medals †. These different omissions are easily accounted for from the negligence of transcribers in writing

* l. c.

† Not. ad Herodot. l. c.

out a tedious genealogy. It would not be so easy to account for their inserting a name without authority ; because this would not be negligence but invention. In the generations subsequent to PERDICCAS, we find ALCETAS, the father of AMYNTAS, omitted by JUSTIN. Yet there can be no doubt, I think, of his having been really the son of AEROPUS, and father of AMYNTAS, because, as he is placed only three generations before HERODOTUS, it is hardly possible that he could have been inserted by mistake, and the other two lists concur in retaining him.

There

There is upon the whole then indisputable evidence, that CARANUS was the person who removed from Argos, and laid the first foundation of the Macedonian kingdom. There is also good authority for supposing that PERDICCAS, who completed the work of CARANUS, and first assumed the title of King, was not the *brother*, as Sir ISAAC from the ambiguous authority of HERODOTUS presumes, but the *great grandson* of CARANUS. The list and order of generations will therefore stand thus, precisely as in SYNCELLUS :

1. CARANUS.
2. COENUS.
3. TYRIMMAS.
4. PER-

220 ON THE CHRONOLOGY

4. PERDICCAS. 5. ARGÆUS.
6. PHILIPPUS. 7. AEROPUS.
8. ALCETAS. 9. AMYNTAS.
10. ALEXANDER. Ten kings

make nine generations, as it is always necessary to strike off either the first or the last of the list. Divide then 264, the number of years between Phidon and the expedition of Xerxes, by 9, the number of generations, and the quotient will be 29, with a remainder of 3 : that is, the portion of time for each generation will be exactly 29 years and 4 months ; which is considerably less than Sir ISAAC himself allows. And I have already shewn at large, that if we calculate at all,
it

it must be by generations, the number of kings furnishing no ground whatever for rational argument.

And now having, I think, evinced the insufficiency of Sir ISAAC's arguments to overthrow the Chronology of the Olympiads, I will, to shew my own fairness, produce two which he has overlooked. The Scholiast of PINDAR, in his Commentary on the second and third Olympic Odes, gives us, as it should seem, the genealogy of THERON, the contemporary of PINDAR. In the former place he begins it thus * : 1. LAIUS. 2. OEDIPUS.

* Schol. in Pindar, O. II. v. 82.

222 ON THE CHRONOLOGY

3. POLYNICES. 4. THERSANDER.
 5. TISAMENUS. 6. ANTESION.
 7. THERAS. 8. SAMUS. 9. TE-
 LEMACHUS, who removed from
 the island of Thera, and settled
 in Sicily. 10. CHALCIOPEUS.
 11. ÆNESIDAMUS. 12. THERON.

In the latter he gives only the
 immediate progenitors of The-
 ron*: 1. TELEMACHUS, who
 deposed the tyrant PHALARIS.
 2. EMMENIDES. 3. ÆNESIDA-
 MUS. 4. THERON. THERAS,
 the seventh in the first list, was
 contemporary with TEMENUS,
 the conqueror of Argos; from
 whom, according to this list,
 THERON would only be the fifth

* O. III. v. 68.

in descent. Now PINDAR, having been born in Olympiad LXV. we cannot suppose THE-
RON, whom he celebrates, to have been born earlier than Olympiad LV. But from TE-
MENUS to the beginning only of the Olympiads were eight generations. So that if the Scholiast has given us the compleat genealogy, it will follow that there were no less than 55 fictitious Olympiads; which if any one is disposed to believe, I will not be his hindrance.

A second argument might be brought from PAUSANIAS, who tells us *, that PYTHAGORAS the

* Corinthiac. p. 140.

philosopher was the great-grandson of HIPPASUS, and that HIPPASUS was contemporary with REGNIDAS, the grandson of TEMENUS. This makes a still greater defalcation of time ; and I shall therefore leave it in full force, that the advocates for this part of Sir ISAAC NEWTON's System of Chronology may dispose of it as they please.

Before I conclude, I have one general remark to make upon Sir ISAAC's book ; that he finds fault with the earlier part of the Græcian History for having no Chronology ; and yet supposes, that when Chronology, that is, technical

nical Chronology, was introduced by TIMÆUS and others, the only use made of it was to falsify their history. This makes it necessary to explain, in a few words, my notion what Chronology is, and what it is not. I say then, that the Genealogy of a particular family, a series of kings or priestesses, a list of archons, or the records of a public solemnity like the Olympic Games ; none of these are Chronology. But Chronology is that science, which compares those lists, genealogies, and records, together, and adjusts them one to another ; making, if possible, one consistent whole. This is a

Q

work

work that requires, no doubt, the hand of a master, and it requires also an unprejudiced mind. For if the chronologer has any favourite point to establish, if, for instance, he is desirous of extending or contracting any particular period, he will be tempted in his account of public transactions to imitate PROCRUSTES ; to mutilate or stretch them out, as may best serve his purpose. I do not know that the antient chronologers were under any such temptation ; that there was any particular system of history, which they were obliged at all events to make good ; and therefore whatever errors

errors they may have committed, I presume they were only errors of judgement. With respect to the genealogies and records, which preceded this technical chronology, they are still further removed from any suspicion of infidelity. The compilers of them pursued no system, and therefore could be misled by none. The want of Chronology therefore, with which Sir ISAAC reproaches the older Greeks, is a circumstance which, in another point of view, may be considered as strongly supporting their credit.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IN writing p. 179 I overlooked a very material circumstance, mentioned by PAUSANIAS *, and confirmed by STRABO †; which is, that the Eleans made no entry of the Olympiad at which PHIDON the Argive presided. Now PAUSANIAS, having inspected the record at Olympia, could not be misinformed with respect to the particular Olympiad. And hence the age of PHIDON is fixed to a certainty. He could neither be so ancient as the marble makes him, nor so modern as he is supposed by Sir ISAAC NEWTON.

* Eliac. II. p. 509.

† L. VIII. p. 549.

The passage of STRABO proves also the truth of what I have asserted from PAUSANIAS*, that the account kept by the Eleans of the Olympic Games was in the nature of a record, and that it was kept from the time that the Olympiads are referred to numerically.

How perfect this record was, and how carefully PAUSANIAS had examined it, might be further proved by what he says of XENODAMUS of Anticyra, upon whose statue there was an inscription, importing, that he had

* See p. 124—128.

obtained a victory in the *Pancratium* at the Olympic Games.

“If this inscription be true,” says he *, “it should seem, that XENODAMUS obtained this prize in the 211th Olympiad. For this is the only Olympiad omitted in the register of the Eleans.”

It is plain therefore, that PAUSANIAS had inspected the register from beginning to end, and that he had found it perfect in every instance but this. The reason of this particular Olympiad being omitted was probably on account of the irregular interference of NERO, who was present at it.

* Phocic. p. 892.

The correction of HERODOTUS proposed in p. 184. is countenanced by a similar passage of PAUSANIAS, Arcad. p. 631. Δῆλα ἔν ἐσι Χαλκώδονα, ἔ τὸν ἐξ Εὐβοίας, ἢ Τελαμῶνα, ἔ τὸν Αἰγινήτην, ἐπὶ Ἡλείῃς Ἡρακλεῖ μετεσχηκέναι τῆς στρατίας.

THE END.

